STUDIES IN
KALAPURNODAYAM

జి.వి. కృష్ణరావు రచనలు

ఒకటో సంపుటం : సాహిత్య విమర్శ (కావ్యజగత్తు, ఇతర వ్యాసాలు)

రెండో సంపుటం : Studies in Kalapurnodayam

మూడో సంపుటం : నవలలు: పాపికొండలు

నాలుగో సంపుటం : నవలలు: కీలుబొమ్మలు, జఘనసుందరి, రాగరేఖలు,

ఐదో సంపుటం : నాటికలు - నాటకాలు
(ఆదర్శ శిఖరాలు, ప్రతిమ, బొమ్మ ఏడ్చింది.)

ఆరో సంపుటం : పద్యాలు, కథలు, ఇతరాలు

ఏడో సంపుటం : తాత్త్వికం - విగ్రహ వ్యావర్తని, ప్లేటో, కాంట్ ఇతర తాత్త్విక వ్యాసాలు

STUDIES IN
KALAPURNODAYAM

(Literature and its value in life with special reference to Kalāpūrnodayam)

This is approved by the University of Madras for the Ph D Degree

G.V.KRISHNA RÂO

EDITOR
ANNAPAREDDY VENKATESWARA REDDY

A GIFT FROM A DAUGHTER
IN MEMORY OF HER FATHER, THE WRITER

PRABHÁSA PUBLICATIONS
BOSE ROAD - TENALI

Studies in Kalāpūrnodayam

First published in April, 1956
Reprint January, 1999

Prabhāsa Publications
Bose Road, Tenali

Price Rs. 100/-

For Copies
Pallavi Publications
Durgaiah Street
Governorpet - Vijayawāda - 520 002

Graphics & Printers Kalajyothi Process Limited
R T C Cross Roads, Musheerabad
Hyderabad - 500 020

TO

MR HUMAYŪN KABĪR, M.A. (oxon), M.P.

సంపాదకుని మాట

ఒక రచయిత తన రచనల ద్వారానే ఎల్లకాలం సజీవంగా జనాళిలో ఉండగలడు. అదెప్పుడు? ఆయన రచనలో గ్రంథరూపంలోనో, మరో రూపంలోనో అందుబాటులో ఉన్నప్పుడే. కాని దురదృష్టవశాత్తు కృష్ణరావుగారి రచనలు చాలా కాలంగా లభ్యంకావడం లేదు. ఆయన సాహిత్యం మీద పరిశోధనలు చేసే వారంతా, నేను ఆయనకు సన్నిహిత మిత్రుణ్ణి కావడంతో, నన్ను కలిసి, ఆయనను గురించి, వారి గ్రంథాలు లభ్యమయ్యే విధం గురించి అడుగుతూ ఉంటారు. గ్రంథాలు లేక పోవడంతో నేనూ వారికి ఏమి చేయలేని వాడినయ్యాను.

కృష్ణరావుగారి కొమరితలిద్దరూ - ఉమాదేవి, శోభాదేవి - ఎప్పుడు అమెరికానుంచి తెనాలి వచ్చినా, వారిదగ్గర వారి తండ్రిగారి గ్రంథాల ప్రచురణ గురించి ఈ అవసరంతో ప్రస్తావిస్తూ ఉండేవాణ్ణి. వారు ఎప్పుడూ సుముఖతనే వ్యక్తం చేశారు. కాని అది కార్యం రూపం ఆమధ్య జనవరి **1998**న వారు తెనాలి వచ్చినప్పుడు, దాల్చింది. ప్రచురణ బాధ్యతలు నేను స్వీకరిస్తానంటే వారు 'సరే' అన్నారు. నేను దానికి, కృష్ణరావుగారిమీద నాకున్న ఎనలేని గౌరవాభిమానాలను పురస్కరించుకొని, వెంటనే అంగీకరించాను.

ఈ కార్యంలో నేను చాలా మందికి కృతజ్ఞతలు చెప్పుకోవలసి ఉంది.

తొలుదొల్తగా, తమ అమూల్యమైన సలహాలిచ్చి, జి.వి.కె. ని స్థూలంగా పరిచయంచేసే వ్యాసాన్ని వ్రాసి ఇచ్చిన హితశ్రీ గారికి, కృష్ణరావుగారి గ్రంథాలనూ, వ్యాసాలనూ, అందించిన విజయవాడ సిద్ధార్థ సైన్స్ అండ్ ఆర్ట్స్ కాలేజీ సిద్ధార్థ పీఠాపీఠం సంచాలకులు నాగళ్ళ గురుప్రసాద రావుగారికి, అలాగే డి.టి.పి. ప్రింటింగ్, ప్రూఫ్ రీడింగ్ విషయాలలో అడుగడుగునా నాకు కుడిభుజమై నిలిచిన సిద్ధార్థ ఆర్ట్స్ & సైన్స్ కళాశాలలో ఆంగ్లోపన్యాసకులుగా పనిచేస్తున్న ప్రముఖ సాహితీ విమర్శకులు బి. తిరుపతిరావుగారికి, జి.వి. కృష్ణరావుపై పరిశోధన చేసి. పిహెచ్ డి. పొందిన, తెలుగు అకాడమీ లో పనిచేస్తున్న, మాణిక్య లక్ష్మిగారు కృష్ణరావు గారి వివిధ రచనల కాలాలను తెలియ జేశారు - వారికి, గ్రంథాకృతిని గురించి సలహాలు ఇచ్చిన డా. పి.వి. రమణ గారికి, గ్రంథ సేకరణలో అత్యంతంగా సహాయసహకారాలందించిన డా. వెలగా వెంకటప్పయ్య గారికి, అందంగా ముద్రించి ఇచ్చిన కళాజ్యోతి ప్రాసెస్ లిమిటెడ్ హైదరాబాద్ వారికి నేను హృదయ పూర్వకంగా కృతజ్ఞతలు తెలుపుకుంటున్నాను.

— సంపాదకుడు

ప్రకాశకుల మాట

మా నాన్నగారు జీవించి ఉన్నప్పుడే ఆయన రచనలకు పునర్ముద్రణ రాక పోవడం వల్ల అవి దొరకడం దుర్లభంగా ఉండేది. ఆయనమీద పరిశోధనలు సాగించేవారు గ్రంథాలు దొరకక చాల ఇబ్బందులకు గురయ్యారు. ఏ హితశ్రీగారో, రెడ్డిగారో తమ వద్ద ఉన్న మానాన్నగారి రచనలను వారికి ఇచ్చి వారి అవసరాలు తీర్చేవారు ఆవిధంగా వారి దగ్గర కూడా గ్రంథాలు లేకుండా పోయాయి.

తరువాత మానాన్నగారు గతించి నప్పటినుంచి, ఆయన రచనలన్నీ ఒకమారు అచ్చొత్తించాలని రెడ్డిగారు మాకు సూచిస్తూనే ఉన్నారు. మాకూ అదే తలంపు ఉంది. చూస్తుండగానే చాలకాలం గడిచింది.

1998 జనవరిలో మేము భారతదేశానికి వచ్చినప్పుడు శ్రీఅన్నపరెడ్డి వెంకటేశ్వర రెడ్డి గారు మళ్ళీ ఆప్రస్తావన తీసుకొచ్చారు. మేము 'సరే' అన్నాం. రెడ్డిగారిని అచ్చుపని చూడవలసిందిగా అభ్యర్థించాం వారికి మానాన్నగారితో ఉన్న స్నేహ సంబంధాలను పురస్కరించుకొని, సంతోషంతో 'సరే' అన్నారు. ఎంతో శ్రమించి, ఎక్కడెక్కడో వెతికి, దొరకని రచనలను దొరికించుకొని, ఏడు సంపుటాలలో పునర్ముద్రణా నిర్వహణను విజయవంతంగా నిర్వహించినందుకు వారికి మా హృదయపూర్వక కృతజ్ఞతలు.

అలాగే ఈ గ్రంథాలు వెలికి రావడంలో చేయూతనిచ్చిన వారందరికీ కృతజ్ఞతలు తెలుపుకుంటున్నాం.

జి. ఉమాదేవి.
జి. శోభాదేవి.

జీవితం, రచనలు

– హితశ్రీ

ఒక రచయితను అంచనా వేయడానికి, అతడు నిశ్వసించింది ఉచ్ఛ్వసించింది ఏమిటో తెలియాలి అతడు నిశ్వసించింది – అతడు చదివిన చదువు, పొందిన శిక్షణ అతడు ఉచ్ఛ్వసించింది అతడు కావించిన సృష్టి, రాసిన రాతలు

ఆయన ఎంతో చదివారు చదవక రాయడం కుదిరేపనికాదు ప్రాక్పశ్చిమ రససిద్ధాంతాలను, సాహిత్యాన్ని, దర్శనాలను లోతుగా చదివారు

ప్రాక్పశ్చిమ రస సిద్ధాంతాలను ఆస్వాదించారు అంటే అటు అరిస్టటిల్ కావ్యాను శాసనం, ప్లేటో రామణీయకతనుంచి కాంట్ పరతత్వవాదం వరకు, ఇటు భరతుని నాట్య శాస్త్రంతో మొదలెట్టి భామహ, ఉద్భట, బట్టనాయక, భట్టలొల్లట, ఆనందవర్ధన, ఇందు రాజ, అబినవగుప్త, క్షేమేంద్ర, మహిమభట్ట, మమ్మటుల దాకా భారతీయ రస సిద్ధాంతాలను ఔపోశన పట్టారు

అర్ధరాహిత్య రంగస్థలిని (Theatre of the Absurd) అర్ధం చేసుకొన్నారు ''సప్తభంగుల అస్పష్టత'' (Seven Types of Ambignity) లోని స్పష్టతను ఎరిగారు పాక్పశ్చిమ దర్శనాలను మధించారు ఆర్య నాగార్జును నిసాపేక్ష వాదంలో జెనో "Flying arrow is at rest" (ఎగురుతున్న బాణం నిశ్చల స్థితిలో ఉంది) ను చూశారు

మార్క్స్ గతి తర్కం గతిని పరిశీలించి యన్ యమ్ రాయ్ మానవత్వాన్ని (Human-ness) గుర్తించారు

మార్క్స్, హెగెల్‌ల వ్యవస్థలలో (దర్శనాలలో) వ్యక్తిలుప్తమైనాడని, సార్త్ర్ అస్తిత్వంలోని మనిషి అస్తిత్వ వేదనను పట్టుకొన్నారు ఫ్రాయిడ్ స్వప్న శిల్పాన్ని భారతీయ ధ్వని సిద్ధాంతంతో ముడిపెట్టారు ప్రవర్తన వాదాన్ని, గెస్టాల్ట్ సిద్ధాంతాన్ని సాహిత్యానికి అన్వయించారు

ఇదీ క్లుప్తంగా ఆయన విస్తృత కాన్వాస్ దీని మీద ఆయన ఉలితో ఉల్లేఖించారు

సాహితీ మేరువు డాక్టర్ జీ వి కృష్ణరావు పూర్తిపేరు గవిని వెంకటకృష్ణరావు వారి స్వస్థలం తెనాలి తాలూకా కూచిపూడి గ్రామం నివాసస్థలం తెనాలి వారు కూచిపూడిలో 1914లో జన్మించారు వ్యవసాయ కుటుంబం తురుమెళ్ళ, కొల్లూరు హైస్కూళ్ళలో పాఠశాల విద్య అభ్యసించారు యస్ యస్ ఎల్ సి నాటికే ఒక చిన్న నవల, ఒక శతకం రచించారు గుంటూరు ఏ సి కాలేజిలో బి ఏ వరకు చదివారు కాలేజిలో చదివేరోజుల్లోనే "పరాధీని"

ఖండకావ్యం రచించారు 1937లో బి ఏ డిగ్రీ పొందారు గుంటూరులో పళ్ళెపూర్ణ ప్రజ్ఞాచార్యులుగారి దగ్గర సంస్కృతం చదువుకొన్నారు

తెనాలి ఆ రోజుల్లో ఒక సాహితీకేంద్రం చక్రపాణి, కొడవటిగంటి కుటుంబరావు, త్రిపురనేని గోపీచంద్ మొదలైన రచయితలెందరో తెనాలిలో ఉండేవారు వారితో కృష్ణరావుకి పరిచయం ఏర్పడింది సాహిత్యచర్చలు జరుగుతుండేవి గోపీచంద్ సాంగత్యం వల్ల కృష్ణరావుకి పాశ్చాత్య సాహిత్యాభిలాష, ఎం ఎన్ రాయ్ రచనలపట్ల ఆకర్షణ, మార్క్సిస్ట్ దృక్పథం అలవడ్డాయి కొన్నికథలు, నాటికలు రాశారు

డిగ్రీ అందిన తరువాత కృష్ణరావుకి నిరుద్యోగం ఎదురైంది నిరాశా నిస్పృహల అనుభవాలతో ''భిక్షాపాత్ర'' నాటిక రాశారు ఇతివృత్తం కాశీనుంచి వ్యాస నిష్కాసనం మార్క్సిస్టు దృక్పథంతో రాసిన ఈ నాటిక పదహారు భారతీయ భాషల్లోకి అనువదింపబడి ఆకాశవాణి నుంచి ప్రసారితమైంది నిరుద్యోగంతో విసుగెత్తి కృష్ణరావు బెనారస్ హిందూ విశ్వవిద్యాలయంలో ఎం ఏ ఇంగ్లీషు లిటరేచర్‌లో చేరారు ఆంగ్ల సాహిత్యాధ్యయనంలో మునిగి తేలారు ఎం ఏ చదువుతున్న రోజుల్లోనే ''కావ్య జగత్తు'' సాహిత్య విమర్శనా గ్రంథం రచించారు దేశ కాల పరిస్థితుల్ని అనుసరించి కావ్యాల్లో వస్తువు రూపం ఎలా మార్పు చెందుతుందో ఇందులో మార్క్సిస్టు దృక్పథంతో వివరించారు ఇది చాలా ప్రసిద్ధమై విశ్వవిద్యాలయాల్లో పాఠ్యపుస్తకమైంది పరిస్థితులు అనుకూలించక కృష్ణరావు ఎం ఏ పరీక్షలు రాయకుండానే 1941లో తిరిగి వచ్చారు

కాశీ నుంచి తిరిగి వచ్చింతరువాత కృష్ణరావు జర్నలిజంలోకి అడుగు పెట్టారు కొంతకాలం మిత్రులతో కలిసి ఓ ప్రెస్, ఓ ఫర్నీచర్ షాపు నడిపారు అవేవీ విజయవంతం కాలేదు ఇంతలో ''ఆంధ్రప్రభ''లో సబ్ ఎడిటర్ పదవి లభించింది నార్ల, శ్రీశ్రీలతో పాటు '' ఆంధ్ర ప్రభ'' సంపాదక వర్గంలో పనిచేశారు ఆ కాలంలో ''జఘనసుందరి'' నవల రాశారు ఇది ఫ్రాయిడ్ సిద్ధాంతాల్ని తార్కికంగా బేరీజు వేసే ప్రసిద్ధ నవల ఆ తరవాత సంపాదకవర్గ నిర్ణయానుసారం కృష్ణరావు ''ఆంధ్రప్రభ'' నుండి వైదొలగారు దేశాభిమాని, విజయప్రభ పత్రికల్లో కొంత కాలం పని చేసి విరమించుకొన్నారు

పత్రికారంగానికి ఉద్వాసన పలికి కృష్ణరావు పిహెచ్ డి డిగ్రీ కోసం మద్రాసు విశ్వవిద్యాలయంలో పరిశోధనకు పూనుకొన్నారు పింగళి సూరన ''కళాపూర్ణోదయం'' వారి దృష్టిని ఆకట్టుకొంది "Studies in Kalapoornodayam" అనే ఆంగ్ల గ్రంథాన్ని డాక్టరేట్ కోసం రాయాలని సంకల్పించి ఆ పరిశోధనలో నిమగ్నులయ్యారు ఈలోగా వారికి వ్యక్తి స్వాతంత్ర్యం మీద జిజ్ఞాస కలిగి తత్వ శాస్త్ర గ్రంథాల్ని తిరిగేశారు జేగంటలు-కాంట్ పరతత్వవాదం, ప్లేటో-ప్రచురించారు తాత్విక చింతన స్వతంత్ర విచారానికి దారి తీసింది

తత్ఫలితమే 1951లో ''కీలుబొమ్మలు'' నవలా రచన ఇది కృష్ణరావుకి ఎంతో పేరు తెచ్చిపెట్టిన విఖ్యాత నవల ఇటీవల ఇది ఆంగ్లంలోకి అనువదించబడి మాక్మిలన్ కంపెనీచే ప్రచురింపబడింది వ్యక్తిలో కర్తవ్య జిజ్ఞాసని రేకెత్తించటమే ఈ నవల లక్ష్యం

అప్పుడప్పుడు రాసిన నాటికల్ని గుదిగుచ్చి ''ఆదర్శ శిఖరాలు '' నాటికల సంపుటి ప్రచురించారు ఇది విలువల కాణాచి

మద్రాసు విశ్వవిద్యాలయం "Studies in Kalapurnodayam" ఆంగ్ల వ్యాసానికి కృష్ణరావుకి 1955లో పిహెచ్ డి డిగ్రీ ప్రధానం చేసింది ''కళాపూర్ణోదయం''లో కళ ఎలా పూర్ణోదయం చెందిందో ఈ గ్రంధంలో కృష్ణరావు పింగళి సూరనని ప్రపంచ కవుల సరసన నిలబెట్టారు 1952లో కృష్ణరావు తెనాలిలో వి యస్ ఆర్ కాలేజిలో అధ్యాపకునిగా చేరారు ఈ రోజుల్లో మాధ్యమిక వాదంలో కుతూహలం కలిగి ఆర్యనాగార్జునుని గ్రంధాలను కొన్నిటిని పద్యాలుగా అనువదించారు అవి పోయాయి ''విగ్రహవ్యావర్తని'' నిమాత్రం తిరిగి అనువదించి విపుల భూమికతో ప్రచురించారు కేంద్రసాహిత్య అకాడమీ తరుపున ప్లేటో 'రిపబ్లిక్' గ్రందాన్ని ''ఆదర్శరాజ్యం'' పేరుతో తెలుగు చేశారు ''రాగరేఖలు'' నవలరాశారు

1962లో పరిస్థితులతో రాజీపడలేక కాలేజి ఉద్యోగానికి తిలోదకమిచ్చారు మళ్ళీ నిరుద్యోగం ఈ సమయంలో ''పాపికొండలు'' నవల ప్రారంభించారు అది దిన పత్రికలో సీరియల్‌గా వచ్చింది అధికారం మనుషుల్ని ఎలా మత్తుల్ని చేస్తుందో వివరించటం ఈ నవల ఇతివృత్తం ఇందులో కృష్ణరావు తన ఆలోచనా రీతులను వ్యంగ్య వైభవంతో నిక్షేపించారు ఇది ఒక రసగంగ స్వల్ప కాలం పొన్నూరు సంస్కృత కళాశాల ప్రిన్సిపల్‌గా పనిచేసి, కృష్ణరావు 1963లో ఆలిండియా రేడియో విజయవాడ కేంద్రంలో స్పోకెన్ వర్డ్ ప్రొడ్యూసర్‌గా పదవి నధిష్టించారు ఈసారి మాత్రం 1973లో పదవీ విరమణచేసేవరకు ఉద్యోగంలో కొనసాగారు రేడియో ఉద్యోగంలో ఉన్ననాడే భాస మహాకవి సంస్కృత నాటకం ప్రతిమ నాటకాన్ని తెలుగు చేశారు కొన్ని కవితలు, కథలు, సాహిత్య వ్యాసాలు చేర్చి ''ఉద బిందువులు'' సంపుటి ప్రచురించారు

రేడియో ఉద్యోగంతో కుంటుపడిన ''పాపికొండలు'' రచన కృష్ణరావు అనారోగ్య కారణాలవల్ల అర్ధంతరంగా ఆగిపోయింది ఇది తెలుగువారి దురదృష్టం 1979లో ''బొమ్మ ఏడ్చింది'' నాటకం వెలువడింది ఇది ఆర్యనాగార్జునునికీ, అప్పటి పాలకుడు గౌతమీ పుత్ర శాతకర్ణి, అతని తల్లి గౌతమీ బాలశ్రీకి సంబంధించిన ఇతివృత్తంతో రాసిన నాటకం రాజ్యపాలకులు మత నిరపేక్షంగా రాజ్యం చేయాలని ఇందులో సందేశం

తెనాలిలోని శ్రీ అరవింద సాహిత్య సేవా సమితి ఆధ్వర్యంలో డాక్టర్ జి వి కృష్ణరావుకి తెనాలిలో మార్చి 30, 1979 తేదీన అప్పటి ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ సాహిత్య అకాడమీ అధ్యక్షులు శ్రీ బెజవాడ గోపాలరెడ్డి గారి అధ్యక్షతన మన సన్మానం కన్నుల పండువగా జరిగింది తరవాత వారు ఎక్కువ కాలం జీవించలేదు కృష్ణరావు ఆగష్టు 23, 1979 తేదీన తుది శ్వాస విడిచారు

రచనల వైశిష్ట్యం

కృష్ణరావు సంస్కృతాంధ్ర ఆంగ్ల బాషల్లో విద్వాంసులు ఆయా భాషా సాహిత్యాల్లో నిష్ణాతులు వ్యాకరణ సూత్రాల్ని, అలంకార శాస్త్రాన్ని లోతుగా తరచి ఆకళింపు చేసుకొన్నవారు ప్రాచ్య పాశ్చాత్య తత్వ శాస్త్రాల్ని మథించిన వారు సామాజిక, రాజకీయనైతిక, మనోవైజ్ఞానిక శాస్త్రాల్ని అవలోడించిన వారు ప్రాక్ పశ్చిమ దేశాల విభిన్న సంస్కృతుల్ని అవగాహన చేసుకొన్నవారు అనన్య ప్రతిభావ్యుత్పత్తులతో, బహుముఖ పరిజ్ఞానంతో, సునిశిత ఆలోచనలతో కృష్ణరావు ఉత్తమ కవితల్ని, నాటక నాటికల్నీ, కథల్నీ, నవలల్ని, సాహిత్య విమర్శనా వ్యాసాల్నీ రచించి తమ సాహితీ చైత్ర రథాన్ని 1963 శోభాయమానం చేశారు ఆ పూదోట సర్వాంగ సుందరం, పరిమళభరితం

కృష్ణరావు జీవితాన్ని, రచనల్ని పరిశీలిస్తే వారి జీవితంలో, రచనల్లో అంతర్వాహినిగా బారతీయత ప్రవహించటం గోచరిస్తుంది ఎర్రగా, సన్నగా, పొడుగ్గా, గరుడనాసికతో, తీక్షణమయిన కనుదోయితో ఎప్పుడూ తెల్లని లాల్చీ, గ్లాస్కో ధోవతి ధరించి అచ్చం భారతీయుడుగా, ఆంధ్రుడుగా కృష్ణరావు కనపడేవారు వివిధ సంస్కృతుల్ని పరిశీలించి వారు చివరకి భారతీయ సంస్కృతి వైపే మొగ్గు చూపారు ఆంగ్లంతో పాటు సంస్కృతాంధ్రాలను చక్కగా చదువుకొన్నారు ప్రాచీన సంస్కృతాంధ్ర కవుల రచనల్ని సమీకరించారు మన సామాన్య ప్రజానీకం విలువలన్ని రామాయణ భారతాల నుంచి వారసత్వంగా వచ్చినవేనని అభిభాషించారు అలంకార శాస్త్రంలో భారతీయ ధ్వని సిద్ధాంతమే పరమ శిరోధార్యంగా భావించారు వారినాటికల్లో అనేకం భారతీయ సాంస్కృతిక ఇతివృత్తంలో కలవే నాగార్జున మాధ్యమిక వాదాన్ని అభిమానించారు భాస ప్రతిమ నాటకాన్ని అనువదించారు కళాపూర్ణోదయం మీద థీసిస్ రాశారు సృజనాత్మకరచన సద్యః పర నిర్వృతి నివ్వాలని భారతీయ లాక్షణికులతో ఏకీభవించారు అయితే భారతీయమంతా ఆమోదయోగ్యమని కృష్ణరావు భావించేవాడు ఏ విషయాన్నయినా కార్యకారణాలతో తర్కించి నిగ్గు తేల్చే హేతువాది కృష్ణరావు తన పరీక్షకి నిలబడిన వాటినే స్వీకరించారు మొదట మార్క్సిస్టు ప్రభావానికి లోనయ్యారు త్వరలోనే ఆ ప్రభావంనుంచి బయట పడ్డారు ''డమడమాలబండి'' నాటిక వారి కనువిప్పుకి రూపకల్పన వ్యష్టిలో సమిష్టినీ, సమిష్టిలో వ్యష్టిని గుర్తించినప్పుడే ఏ రాజకీయ

వ్యవస్ద అయినా అభ్యుదయం సాధిస్తుందని కృష్ణరావు భావించారు లేకపోతే అది వట్టి నినాదాల డమడమాలబండే అలాగే ''కార్యజగత్తు''లోని మార్క్సిస్టు దృష్టిమారి వారి సాహిత్య విమర్శనా ప్రతిభ కళాపూర్ణోదయ సిద్దాంత గ్రంధంలో వెల్లి విరుస్తుంది

కృష్ణరావు ఆదర్శం ధర్మం ఆశయం వ్యక్తి స్వాతంత్ర్యం ''ధర్మం'' ధర్మం కోసమే, ఆధర్మమే మానవ జీవితం అంటారు కృష్ణరావు ''కీలుబొమ్మలు'' నవలలో ధర్మానుష్ఠానంలోనే ఆనందం ఉన్నదనుకొని చేసినప్పుడే వ్యక్తికీ, తద్వారా సమాజానికీ అభ్యుదయం సిద్ధిస్తుందని కృష్ణరావు విశ్వాసం వ్యక్తులకి స్వతంత్ర విచారం ఉండాలి వ్యక్తికి అంతఃకరణం ఉంటుంది అది వివేక చోదితం పరిస్థితులు చుట్టు ముట్టినప్పుడు ప్రతి వ్యక్తీ స్వతంత్రాలోచనతో తన అంతఃకరణం సాక్షిగా ప్రవర్తించి తన ధర్మాన్ని తాను నిర్వర్తించాలి లేనినాడు అధర్మం ప్రవర్తిల్లి సమాజం సంక్షోభం చెందుతుంది ఇదే ''కీలుబొమ్మలు'' నవల సందేశం అంతేకాని వ్యక్తులు పరిస్దితుల కీలుబొమ్మలని కాదు వ్యక్తి ధర్మం లుప్తమైతేనే దేశం శప్తమవుతుంది వ్యక్తి స్వాతంత్ర్యాన్ని ఉద్దీప్తం చేయటం రచయిత బాధ్యత అని కృష్ణరావు తలచారు ఈ వ్యక్తి స్వాతంత్ర్య చేతనే ''పాపికొండలు'' నవలలో మరింత స్పష్టమవుతుంది ఇందులోని కొన్ని పాత్రలు పరిస్దితులకు ఎదురునిలచి తాము నమ్మిన ధర్మాన్ని అనుసరించి తమ వ్యక్తిత్వాన్ని నిలబెట్టుకొంటాయి ''బొమ్మ ఏడ్చింది'' నాటకంలో ఆర్య నాగుర్జునల పాత్ర అలాంటిదే

కృష్ణరావు దృష్టిలో జీవితం, కళా వేరువేరు కావు అవి రెండూ ఒకటే జీవిత ప్రవాహానికి ఆద్యంతాలు లేవు అది అనంతం దాన్ని అర్దం చేసుకోటానికి ఉపకరించే ఆద్యంత సహిత జీవిత శకలమే కళ – అంటారు వారు

కళాత్మకమైన రచన జీవితపు విలువల్ని నిర్దేశించి వెలుగునివ్వాలని కృష్ణరావు తాత్పర్యం విలువ అంటే ఏ వస్తువులో నయినా మన మెప్పుకి పాత్రమైన గుణం జీవితపు విలువలనేకం వాటిని ఆర్దిక, నైతిక, సామాజిక, తాత్విక విలువలుగా వర్గీకరించవచ్చు విలువలకి ఆధిక్యతా క్రమం ఉంటుంది తాత్విక విలువలు పై విలువలైతే ఆర్దిక విలువలు కిందివి సామాజిక నైతిక విలువలది మధ్యస్దానం భారతీయ సంస్కృతి తాత్విక విలువల్ని జీవిత ధ్యేయాలుగా ఆదరించి జీవితావశ్యకాలైనా ఆర్దిక విలువల్ని విస్మరించింది ఇది దారిద్ర్యానికి దారితీసిందనే అభియోగం ఉంది ఇది కృష్ణరావుని కలవరపెట్టింది డిగ్రీ పుచ్చుకొన్నతరువాత నిరుద్యోగం కర్కశ నిజమై చికాకు పరచింది వ్యాసుడు గుండెల్లోంచి పైకి వచ్చి శాపజలం అందుకొన్న దృశ్యం తళుక్కుమంది 'భిక్షాపాత్ర'' నాటిక ఆవిర్భవించింది అది ఆకలి పోలికేక మార్క్సిస్టు దృక్పధంతో ఆర్దిక విలువల్ని హైలైట్ చేసిన రచన కృష్ణరావు నిజ జీవితంలో విలువల్ని అపారంగా గౌరవించారు నమ్మిన విలువల కోసం ఉద్యోగాల్ని తృణప్రాయంగా చూశారు కృష్ణరావు

దృష్టిలో విలువలన్నీ సమాదరణీయాలే వారి ''ఆదర్శ శిఖరాలు'' నాటికల సంపుటిలో నాటికలన్నీ విలువల దీప్తి రేఖలే ఈ సంపుటిలో మొదటిది ''భిక్షాపాత్ర'' చివరిది తాత్విక విలువల్ని ప్రతిపాదించే ''ఆదర్శ శిఖరాలు'' ఇది మహాశిల్పి జక్కణాచార్యుల కథ మధ్యలో వన్ని ఇతర విలువల్ని ప్రతిపాదించేవి ఇవన్నీ వ్యక్తి ధర్మాన్ని ప్రబోధించే విలువల వెలుగులు ఆర్థిక, నైతిక, సామాజిక, తాత్విక విలువల సమాహారాన్ని అనుభూతిలోకి తెచ్చుకొని మానవ వ్యక్తి సంపూర్ణ సమగ్ర చరితార్థత సంతరించుకోవాలని కృష్ణరావు ధ్వని

''బొమ్మ ఏడ్చింది'' నాటకం మతానికి విలువలకి సంబంధించిన కొన్ని మౌలిక దార్శనిక విషయాలను స్పృశిస్తుంది మతం అంతిమ విలువ అది కొంత వైయక్తికం, కొంత నైతికం నైతిక విలువలూ ఒక విధంగా సామాజికాలే అందువల్ల సామాజిక స్పర్శ ఉన్న మేరకు ప్రభుత్వం మతంతో ప్రమేయం కల్పించుకోవచ్చు ఆ పరిధిని దాటి రాజ్యం వాటి విలువలతో సంబంధం పెట్టుకోరాదు ''బొమ్మ ఏడ్చింది'' నాటకంలో రాజు గౌతమీ పుత్రశాతకర్ణి హిందూ మతానుయాయి బౌద్ధుల్ని బాధిస్తాడు ఆర్య నాగార్జునల ఉపదేశం పెడచెవిని పెడతాడు నాగార్జునులకు దేశ బహిష్కరణ శిక్ష విధిస్తాడు ఈ అధర్మానికి బొమ్మ ఏడుస్తుంది ఈ బొమ్మ బౌద్ధుల ఆరాధ్య దేవత షట్పారమితాదేవి ఓ పాత్ర ద్వారా ''ఆ బొమ్మ మానవుల మనస్సుల్లో మెదిలిన నాడే లోకకళ్యాణం'' అంటారు కృష్ణరావు ఇది ప్రస్తుత సమాజానికి అన్యాప దేశమైన కర్తవ్య బోధ

కృష్ణరావు కొన్ని సాహిత్య వ్యాసాల్ని, సాహిత్య విమర్శనా వ్యాసాల్ని, తాత్విక వ్యాసాల్నీ రచించారు వాటిలో వారి నిశిత మేధాశక్తి, సహేతుకత, అంతర్ దృష్టి అంతర్లీనంగా ద్యోతకమవుతుంది కృష్ణరావు శైలి తెలుగు నుడికారపు ఇంపుసొంపులకి పట్టు కొమ్మ

జీవితం నిరంతర స్రవంతి సమాజం నిత్య పరిణామ శీలం గలది వ్యక్తి యుక్తాయుక్త విచక్షణా జ్ఞానం కలవాడు భావజీవి సంస్కృతి పరంపరా గతమైంది సాహిత్యం సౌందర్య సంబంధి సౌందర్యం వస్తుగతం, హృదయ గతం కూడా ఇవన్నీ పరస్పర ఆశ్రితాలు కృష్ణరావు సాహిత్యం మానవసంబంధాల్ని పరామర్శించి వాటిలోని అంతరార్థాన్ని వెలుగులోకి తెస్తూ, పాఠకుడిలో సమాధ్యవస్థ కల్పిస్తుంది ఆనందమిస్తుంది ఆలోచన రేకెత్తిస్తుంది లోకకల్యాణ మార్గం సూచిస్తుంది ఇది సహృదయ హృదయైక వేద్యం

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

MAHAKAVYA

Kalāpūrṇōdayam and its reception - Mahākāvya - Bhāmaha's definition - Dandın's view - Nannecōda's conception - The echoes of Vıdyānatha and Vinnakōṭa Peddana - Viśvanatha's epitomısatıon - Critıcal exmınation of the definition of the Mahakāvya. pp. 1- 12.

CHAPTER 2

THE STORY OF KALĀPŪRṆŌDAYAM IN OUTLINE

pp. 13 - 26.

CHAPTER 3

THE SO- CALLED SOURCES

Kādambari and Kalāpūrnōdayam - Comparison - The former not a source - Prabōdhacandrōdaya - Mārkaṇdeya Purāṇa - The story of Madālasa - The four epısodes in the Mahābharata - Narada's conflict with Tumburu as descnbed in the Lıngapurāṇa - Consıderatıon of the Manucharıtra and the Sri-kālahasti-māhātmyam as sources and their refutatıon - Kathāsaritsāgara of Sōmadēva and its ınfluence on Surana - The opening story in the Kathāsarıtsāgara - comparıson - the story of Śrıdatta - The story of the Unfaıthful Wife - The story of Sūryaprabha - Influences of the Kathāsarıtsāgara on the Kalāpūrṇōdayam in general - Āścaryacūḍāmanı of Śaktı- bhadra as an influence - Other reasons in suport of the orıgınalıty of the poem. pp. 27 - 61.

CHAPTER 4

THE THREE ALLEGORIES AND THEIR REFUTATION

The philosophical allegory and the reasons for its refutatıon- The erotic allegory and the causes for its untenability - The historical allegory, only an illusion - Allegory, *śleṣa* and *dhvani* distinguished. pp. 62 - 74.

CHAPTER 5

SURANA AND HIS CRITICS

An approach to literature - Dr. C. R. Reddi's attacks - His remarks about the *maṇihāra* untenable - The question of probability - assaults against the latter part of the poem unreasonable. pp. 75 - 110

CHAPTER 6

POSITIVE MERITS OF THE KALAPURNODAYAM

Sūrana's characters definite, concrete and human - Nārada - Maṇikandhara - Kalabhāsiṇi - Sugatri - Maṇistambha alias Śālinā - Caturmukha and Sarasvati. pp. 111 - 148.

CHAPTER 7

POSITIVE MERITS OF THE KALAPURNODAYAM (Contd.)

The significant background - Nāmavakrata - Structural beauties - The beauties of presentation. pp. 149 - 175.

CHAPTER 8

KALAPURNODAYAM AS A MAHAKAVYA

The five *sandhis* and the sixty-four *sandhyaṅgas* - The various descriptions to be found in the poem - The *rasas*. pp. 176 - 194.

CHAPTER 9

ON THE MEANING OF THE POEM

Complete emergence of art - The central idea of the poem - Reasons for such a theory - The highly complicated nature of the poem - References to the nature of poetry and *phalaśruti* - Maṇikandhara's antecedents and subsequent activities - The names of Manistambha and Sumukhāsatti, their native country and their family deity - The episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha - the names of Kalāpūrna, Abhinavakaumudi, Madhuralālasa, Suprasāda and Sarasa - Introducing tenets of philosophy - The poet's ardent hope of getting publicity for his poem through the co-operation of *śāstravyasanātidhanyas* - The very title of the poem. - pp. 195 - 213

CHAPTER 10

SURANA'S PHILOSOPHY

The poet not an Advaitin - His leanings in Kalāuṛnodayam not a simple mask - Sūrana not committed to Advaita in his other works - Not a follower of Pratyabhijña School of Kashmir - the poet only a Viśistadvaitin.

pp. 214 - 224.

CHAPTER 11

VISISTADVAITA AND ITS THEORY OF BEAUTY

Epistemology of Viśiṣṭādvaita - *Prameya* - *Prakṛti* and *Kāla* - *Nityavibhūti* - *Dharmabhūtajñana* - *Jīva* - *Īśvara* - Nature of Beauty according to Viśistadvaita - Beauty, the quality of the Absolute - Comprises truth goodness, knowledge, *ānanda* etc. - Not the object of perception, recollection, recognition, inference analogy, presumption and negation - Realisable only through intuition - Does not evolve nor admit division - Beauty infinite - Manifests itself in five forms, *para, vibhava, vyūha, antaryāmin* and *arca* - The two values of Beauty, intrinsic and utilitarian - The hierarchy of arts - Artists and aesthetes mainly devotees - Theory of *rasa* - Abhinavagupta, Paṇḍitarāya - Visistadvaitin's interpretation - Theory of *rasa* and Visistadvaita not mutually incompatible - The whole province of Beauty not covered by *rasa*.

pp. 225 - 257.

CHAPTER 12

SURANA'S THEORY OF BEAUTY AND OF ITS EMERGENCE

Sūrana's suggestion of his theory of Beauty - His conception of poetry and of the emergence of Art - Critical examination of his theory - Conclusion.

pp. 258 - 280.

Notes pp. 281 - 315.

Appendices pp. 316 - 333.

PREFACE

The present thesis, "Studies in Kalāpūrṇōdayaṁ" (Literature and Its Value in Life with special reference to the Kalāpūrṇōdayam) constitutes the result of the author's research work done from 1949 to 1952 at the University of Madras.

This essay proposes to expound the nature of Beauty in general, and literature and its value in particular, as suggested by Pingali Surana in his work, Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Before this exposition is undertaken, it is necessary to show positively that such a suggestion exists in the poem because even its possibility has not yet been discussed. This second point also, therefore, becomes an important part of this essay.

Every work of art, as is generally admitted, is the outcome of historical events and the ideological inheritance of its age. While pure idealists maintain that it is entirely determined by the previous ideas, materialists advocate the opposite view that it is the superstructure of the established economic relations of that particular age. Both these schools adopt views too extreme to be acceptable. Perhaps striking the balance between the two, a third view says:- "The dynamics of ideas runs parallel to the process of social evolution, the two influencing each other mutually. But at no particular point of the process of the integral human evolution, can a direct casual relation be established between historical events and the movement of ideas. Cultural patterns and ethical values are not mere ideological superstructures of established economic relations. They are also historically determined by the logic of the history of ideas."

This view appears to be more reasonable because a literary work particularly when it is highly imaginative, as Hegel postulates, is the ideal among the Fine Arts. Consequently, the emergence of the Kalapurnodayam has to be traced to its origination more through the history of ideas than through the historical events of the age of Sūrana. But this does not imply that the latter are to be completely ignored.

Simple awareness of this fact is not in any way helpful in the case of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam because material pertaining to the social history apart from that avilable in the poetic works of that period is almost as scarce as hen's teeth. Letting alone the poet's biographical events, even the exhaustive list of his works is not known. Hence there is no other alternative than to depend upon the former method which consists in tracing its origination through history of ideas.

A work of art, howsoever organically as a whole it may be conceived, has a form and content which can be clearly analysed. A thorough understanding of these aspects is essential to grasp the suggested idea of the work. The form which the Kalāpūrṇōdayam takes is the Mahakavya or Mahāprabandha whose historical development and evlution has to be traced with a view to finding out its exact requirements. The content also which is a group of ideas, is to be carefully examined on the basis of external and internal evidences with a view to seeing whether the theme is borrowed from old works prior to the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. If it is borrowed *in toto* or with slight modifications, it is necessary to see in the former case the context and purpose of the original work, and in the latter, the object of such modifications. The result of this enquiry will go a long way towards understanding the main purport of the suggested idea of the poem, and at the same time will help to indicate the poet's conception of the role of ideological and cultural heritage in the emergence of a work of art if he had really written his poem with that object in view.

Comments, expositions and criticisms concerning the Kalāpūrṇōdayam are to be studied with the main purpose of arriving at the real purport of the poem and finding out whether any questions remain unanswered if the suggested meaning is not taken into account. In the light of these findings, the merits of the poem are to be explored so as to ascertain which of them are required by the exigencies of the form and content, and which by the poet's own theory of Beauty and Literature.

The results accruing from this enquiry provide reasons for or against maintaining that the Kalapurnodayam was written to suggest the nature of Beauty in general, and of literature in particular. When these happen to substantiate the positive aspect, the poet's philosophy is to be investigated and determined, because, without it there cannot be any consistent and genuine theory of Beauty. From the epistemology and metaphysics of the poet's philosophy, the theory of Beauty in general and literature and its value in particular are to be carefully deduced. In the light of the broad principles thus obtained, the poet's own theory of Beauty as suggested by the Kalāpūrṇōdayam has to be explained. When a writer believes in and suggests a certain theory, it will be rather improbable that he should not follow the very principles thereof. Those very principles, therefore, are to be illustrated from his own work, and then evaluated.

This very same method is followed, but its success depends upon the extent to which dispassionate and disinterested enquiry is brought to bear on it. Besides, there are two grave dangers - firstly, when a regular source having a different purport is traced and established. But this possibility seems to be rather negligible in view of the fact that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam has an inseparable connection with the other works of the poet. Secondly, when history comes into possession of more facts than it has now on hand and proves that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is the direct result of some other outlook than that of Visistadvaita, thew hole essay, it is needless to say, simply collapses like a house of cards. In that case the poem once again becomes an enigma for the critic.

This essay does not claim infallibility, or perfection. The author is too well aware of its limitations.

It is necessary to mention that the author is deeply indebted in producing this essay to the learned Mr. Nidudavōlu Venkata Rao, Senoir Lecturer and Head of the Department of Telugu, at the University of Madras. Words fail the author to express his gratitude to Mr. K.V. Gopālaswāmy, M.A. (Oxon.), Barrister-at-

law, Registrar, Andhra University, without whose sympathetic and benevolent encouragement this essay would never have been attempted. He has to express his thanks to the authorities of the University of Madras for permitting him to have his thesis published and to Mr. S.P. Ragland, M.A., L.T., Principal, V.S.R. College, Tenali, for going through the press copy and making invaluable suggestions.

The author in this context, cannot but express his deep gratitude to Mr. K. Mādhavaiah and to Mr. M. Chalapati Rāo for extending all the facilities to print and publish this thesis.

TENĀLI **G.V. Krishnarāo.**

24-3-56.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A. B.	...	Abhinavabhārati
A. M. B.	...	Andhra Mahābhāratamu
A. Dh. A.	...	Āndhradhvanyālōkamu
		Kavitā Vimarśanamu
A. B. K. V.	...	Āndhra Bhārata Kavita Vimarsanamu
A. M.	...	Āmuktamālyada
Ap.	...	Appakavīyamu
A. S.	...	Abhijñānaśākuntala
Bh.	...	Bhārati
Bh. K.	...	Bhāskararāmāyaṇamu
C. A.	...	Comparative Aesthetic
Dh. A.	...	Dhvanyāloka
Ḍ. R.	...	Daśarūpaka
K.	...	Kādambari
K. A.	...	Kāvyādarsa
K. An.	...	Kāvyānuśāsana
K. A. S.	...	Kāvyālaṁkārasaṁgraha
K. A. S. V.	...	Kāvyālaṁkara Sūtra Vrtti
K. B.	...	Kṛṣṇa Bhāratamu
K. C.	...	Kāvyālamkāracūdāmaṇi
K. Pr.	...	Kāvyaprakāśa
K. P.	...	Kalāpūrṇōdayamu
K. S.	...	Kumārasaṁbhava
K. T. V.	...	Kavitvatattvavicāramu
M. P.	...	Mārkaṇḍēyapurānamu
N. K. S.	...	Nannecōda's Kumārasambhava
N. S.	...	Nātyasāstra
O. S.	...	The Ocean of Story

P. M. ... Pāṇḍuraṅgamahātmyamu

P. P. ... Prabhāvatīpradyumnamu

P. R. ... Pratāparudrīya

P. S. ... Piṅgaḷi Sūrana

P. U. ... Praśnōpaniṣad

P. V. ... Palnāṭi Vīracharitra

R. ... Rāmāyaṇa

R. G. ... Rasagaṅgādhara

R. P. ... Rāghavapāṇḍavīyamu

R. R. ... Raṅganātharāmāyaṇamu

R. S. ... Rasārṇavasudhākara

S. B. ... Śrībhāṣya

S. D. ... Sāhityadarpaṇa

S. Dr. ... Sanskrit Drama

S. K. M. ... Srī-kāla-hasti-mahātmyamu

S. N. ... Sukranītisāra

V. C. ... Vasucaaritra

V. J. ... Vakrōktijivita

Y. M. D. ... Yatīndramatadīpika.

CHAPTER I

MAHĀKĀVYA

I

Pingalisūrana and his three works, the Rāghavapandaviyam, the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and the Prabhava tipradyumnam , are well known to every student of Telugu literature. Though he was rec ognised as a poet of considerable merit by writers and *lākshanikās* of the later period, his main work, the Kalapurṇodayam, did not receive the proper appreciation it deserved. It may not be an ex aggeration to say that, if Sūrana had not written Raghavapaṇḍaviyam, his other works would have been altoghether lost and cleanly forgotten. The fact that it does not enjoy today even so much popularity as Manucaritra and Vasucaritra with our pandits brought up in the old tradition, is a clear indication that Surana was always for creative originality, while his age was for the old and the conventional. Neither the poets, nor the *lakshanikas* of the later period did ever read or care to understand the profundity of the school of *rasadhvani*, once for all firmly established by Abhinavagupta. Their souls, perhaps, were completely lost in the mirage of the Alankarika school of the decadence. Word-play, stale incidents, lifeless episodes of love and hackneyed descriptions of the city, etc. seem to have found much favour wtih them. The more a writer exhibited his scholarship, his capacity for *ślēṣa* and *bandha*, the more they held him in great esteem. A good story depictinig a vast and profound human experience had perhaps but little attraction for them. That was why Ramarajabhusana without the least hesitation could come out with the statement that stories of pure creation are glass beads while stories handed down by tradition are natural gems.[1]

This sort of prejudice is probably rooted in our very schools of philosophy which maintain invariably that knowledge is absolute, that there is no scope whatsoever for new things, and that the ultimate object of man, after all, is to realise the Absolute that

---

G. V. Krishna Rao

exists already. When such is the prevailing notion, it is scarcely any wonder that neither Sūrana's contemporary world nor the literary elite of the succeeding generations cared to pay the proper attention that Kalāpūrṇōdayam deserved. This remark, however, does not rule out the fact that Sūrana was paid homage by some writers here and there[2]; and , as a matter of fact, one or two commentaries wre written.[3] Another writer tried to give the story in a nut shell.[4] What is stressed here is that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam was perhaps not studied in its proper perspective, understood as an organic whole and valued accordingly. Of course there have been some attempts to interpret that poem since the eighteen nineties, but their achievement, as it will be examined later on, appears to fall short of what one might reasonably expect.

Sūrana, the great poet and profound thinker, was always for novelty and original creation. As he explicitly mentions with pride, the Garuḍapurānam, the Rāghavapāṇḍavīyam, the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and the Prabhāvatīpradyumnam are his main works, the first being a translation. It is rather surprising why he began his poetic career by translating a work which is considered inauspicious and read only at funerals. Since this work is lost, the aspects that attracted him, and the objects he achieved in it are quite unknown. His second poem, the Rāghava pāndavīyam is a dvyarthi kavya, the first of its kind in Telugu literature. It describes both the stories of the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa in lucid and simple language. And its greatness lies in his skill in bringing out both the meanings by simple and familier words without any trace of pedantry. Though it lacks *rasa*, as any *kāvya* of this type is bound to do, it is far better than those of the later writers. They might have handled more difficult themes which could not easily be treated simultaneously in one and the same poem; they might have written *tryarthi* or caturarthi *kāvyās*, *kāvyās* conveying three or four meanings, but they were quite unable to achieve the simplicity, lucidity and beauty attained by Surana. This work enabled the poet to take his contemporary world by surprise and force it to recognise his merit. For the first time writers and lākṣaṇikas came to know that sūrana, if he had

chosen to follow the traditions, could have easily excelled any writer of the day; and so admitted him to the rank of the *laksanika kavi* Had he not written this work, alll his other available works might have met with the same fate as that of the Garudapuranam. The Prabhavathi pradyumnam, his last mentioned poem, is a peculiar work combining both the Nataka style and the Mahaprabandha *marga* of his times. The Kalapurnodayam, the subject of this essay, is beyond doubt, *sui generis*. To understand its meaning and significance it is necessary to know the characteristics its form and content. Just as the suggested idea of a sentence cannot be known without grasping the denotative and connotative meanings of the words in their syntactical relation, so also the suggested idea of a poem cannot be known without a clear analysis of its form and content. In the light of the latter alone can one distinguish and appreciate which features and characteristics are determined by the exigencies of form and content, and which by the motive force of the poem. Therefore, it devolves upon one to know the characteristics of the Mahakavya or Mahaprabandha to which literary form the poet explicitly and repeatedly assigns his work[5].

The term *Mahākāvya*[6] or Māhāprabandha[6] has come into vogue in Telugu since Nannicoda's use of it in Kumārasambhavam. Tikkana used the term Prabandha in the Mahābhārata, but one cannot say definitely that he used it in a technical sense though some scholars like Mr. Rāmakrishnayya (Korāda) maintain positively that he did.[7] But to students of Alankāra Sāstra it is well known that the word *prabandha* is a synonym of *kāvya,* for Vāmana in the glossary of his Kāvyālankārasutras mentions it. Mahāprabandha is nothing more than the Mahākāvya which is a species of poem, but not a great poem as its verbal meaning denotes.

II

When the Mahāprabandha is only a synonym of the Mahākāvya, it needs no separate proof that it has a special connotation, for it has been defined since the sixth century onwards by the Ālankarikās. Before trying to form a clear and definite

conception of it, it is necessary to trace its history in this context. As far as is known, Bhamaha is the earliest critic to define this concept. His idea of a Mahakavya, when analysed and expressed in terms of plot, characterisation, construction and the particular type of experience it has to give, may be summarised as follows :-

The theme of the Mahākāvya must be one borrowed from tradition, and must invariably describe noble characters and great deeds. It must be great in magnitude and sublime in content. This does not, however. mean that it may be too long to be grasped in its totality. Diplomacy, sending embassies, tours, wars and glories of the hero, should be its contents, and it must have a prosperous and happy ending. Besides, it must conform to the ways of the world. The hero must be one of high birth , endowed with noble character, wide learning, lovable qualities and great prowess. When such a character is the hero, it is of course natural for him to overcome difficulties and emerge victorious at the end.

The plot, when it is great in magnitude, falls into cantos or chapters, and these are to be closely connected, as in the case of Nataka. That means, it must contain the five *sandhis* mentioned in the Nātyasāstra and the Daśarūpaka. In the first part, the seed of the plot is to be made partially visible. In the third its development, culminating in the attainment or the reverse, is to be delineated and the search after it is to be depicted.The fourth which deals with the investigation is to be followed by the last *nirvāhana sandhi,* wherein all the threads are gathered and the plot is brought to its happy ending.[9] It is not desirable to begin the story with descriptions of the valour, learning and greatness of the rival of the hero and to get him killed in the end in order that the hero's greatness might be established As the rival of the hero is not to dominate the story. and enjoy and participate in the success, so also he is not to be shown at all in the beginning in attractive colours.

In matters of expression, vulgarity of words should be completely avoided, and, on the other hand, the plot must have a great significance. The narrative should be strewn with figures of speech which owe their existence to *vakrōkti.*[10]

As to the experience which the Mahakavya is to give, Bhamaha seems never to have clearly analysed it for himself. No doubt he insists that it should be beautified, but never cares to grasp the characteristics of the Beautiful. That is why he says that the Mahākāvya should contain all the *rasas* separately. And from this it is evident that these *rasas* are nothing but *rasavad-alankarās* and that these should pervade the poem. This experience, while describing the fourfold human value, should relate, as he postulates, chiefly to the acquisitiōn of wealth. 10

Daṇḍin who was the second Alankarika to write on this particular topic, while agreeing with Bhamaha, added a few more details. The theme, he says, must contain also descriptions of cities, seas, mountains, seasons, sun - rise and moon-rise, of parks, sports in water, drunken-bouts, and of amorous dalliance, of separation of lovers, and descriptions of the birth and wedlock of princes, of diplomacy, the sending of ambassadors, of tours, battles and of the hero's glories, Different episodes and incidents sholuld be presented in different places. Regarding its structure, the poem should begin either with invocation or with homage, or with an indication of the subject with which it proposes to deal. The cantos or chapters should be neither too short nor too long; and the metres therein must be pleasant to the ear. Each canto should end in such metres as differ from those of the body. While differing with his predecessor on the mode of presenting the hero's rival, *Daṇḍin* says, "to describe the heredity, valour, learning and other attainments of the hero's rival at first, and then to describe the hero's excellence by the defeat of his foe - this method too appeals to us." He has nothing more to add to the nature of the experience of the Mahakavya except that the body of the poem consists in words having the desired meaning (*istārthavacchinna padāvali*) and that the *gunās* are very important.

If a poem fails to include a few of the elements of the eighteen fold description mentioned above, does it fail to be a Mahakavya? To this Daṇḍin replies:- "Even if a few of the said elements are lacking, a poem does not diminish in value provided the excellence of those that have been adopted pleases the scholars."[12]

While Udbhata did not deal with this literary form, Vāmana advised the readers to consult other works in regard to the elements and construction of the story. The first Telugu poet to mention and write a Mahākāvya is Nannicōda. According to him it consists of descriptions of the eighteen kinds of objects given by Dandin. Without saying anything further about the plot and construction, he maintains that the poem should be sustained by the *gunās,* filled with the nine *rasās* and the *bhāvās* and adorned by the thirty-six *alankārās* Another interesting point to be noted here is that he mentions separately that the poem should be enjoyable. This clearly indicates that Nannicōda's conception of the relation between *rasa* and alankāra is exactly like that of Udbhata who gives the number of the figures of speech relating to the meaning as thirty-six, and that of *rasās* as nine.[13]

Vidyānātha, the author of the Pratāparudrīya, also defines this type of *kāvya,* but he does not provide anything new. He says that the poem which describes the eighteen objects enumerated by Dandin is a Mahakavya. With the latter he agrees that it does not cease to be a Mahākāvya if it omits a few of these elements. 14

Vinnakota Peddana simply echoes the same idea in Kavyālankāracūdāmaṇi, 15

The next Ālankārika who has discussed all the characteristics of the Mahākāvya in the minutest detail is Visvanātha. As to the objects to be described in a Mahākāvya, he advocates the inclusion of the three *sandhyās,* the dusk, darkness, day, hunting expeditions, sages, heaven, and *yajnas* in addition to the eighteen items given by Dandin. As regards the hero, he must be either a divine person or a *dhirōdatta ksattriya* born into a noble family. A number of princes belonging to one and the same high family may be the heroes of the theme.

As to the structure, the poem must open with a benediction or invocation, or a suggestion of the theme Very occasionally, it may begin with the censure of the bad, or with the praise of the good. The canto must be composed in a single metre. In the whole poem there may be one canto which contains various metres. At

the end of every preceding canto, the story of the succeeding canto should be suggested. Though the poem should be neither too short nor too long, it should consist of more than eight cantos. All the *sandhis* of the Nataka are to be in the Mahākāvya, making it thus an organic whole.

Regarding the nature of the experience the Mahākāvya should give. Viśvanātha is more clear and definite than the previously mentioned Alankarikas. Setting aside the claims of *alankarās gunās* and *ritis,* he insists that a Mahakāvya should have one of the three *rasas, srngara, vira* and *santa* as the main, and all the rest as subsidiary Generally, the Mahakavya is conducive to the attainment of the fourfold human value; but it is enough if it helps the realisation of any one of the four.[16]

With the foregoing definitions of the great Ālankārikās in view, one can have a fair conception of this particular type of *kavya* To put its characteristics in a nut-shell:

i) The plot should be either borrowed from tradition or invented by the poet, and should contain the eighteen or twenty-six elements rounded off with a happy ending

ii) The hero must be a divine person or a *dhirodatta kṣattriya* If equal importance is given to a number of characters, such persons must be the descendants of one and the same noble faimily of a princely class.

iii) The poem which begins with benediction, or invocation, or indication of the theme, or censure of the bad, or praise of the good should have more than eight cantos which are neither too short nor too long. Except one, each of them should be composed in a single metre, with different ones at the end, suggesting the story of the succeeding canto. The whole structure must be organic with the five *sandhis*

iv) Lastly, one of the three *rasās, 'śrngāra, vira* and *'sānta,* must be the principal *rasa* with the rest of the nine subordinate to it. It must help to realise the fourfold human value, or any one of the four.

III

Now to a modern mind many doubts may occur as to the necessity of all the conditions mentioned in the definition of the Mahākāvya. Why should it have only those twenty six elements and not others like descriptions of villages etc. ? Are greatness and nobility the monopoly of monarchs and princes? Why cannot the poem begin directly with the theme proper? Does a poem cease to be a Mahākāvya simply because it consists of less than eight cantos, and every canto contains various metres ? Finally, why should one of the three *rasás* only be the main and not the others ? Is not the Rāmāyana in which the principal *rasa* is *karuna,* a Mahākāvya ? When examined in the light of these questions, do not the characteristics mentioned by the Ālankārikās appear arbritrary, and dependent on tradition rather than on the intrinsic necessity of aesthetic experience or artistic creation?

An answer to these questions in minute detail requires a separate treatise. However, as an examination of the Kalāpūrnōdayam as a Mahākāvya is relevant to the main object of this essay, it is necessary to answer them. To begin with, a Mahākāvya is a poem which gives us not merely a single *bhāva,* a single situation, or a particular aspect of life, or a character, or an idea or mood, but also a comprehensive experience that is self-sufficient and selfevident. Then only can it be great both in quantity and quality. As a matter of fact, this is explicitly brought out by Bhamaha when he uses the epithets, *'mahatam mahacca'.* This can be achieved only when *'śrngāra* or *vīra* or *karuna* or *śānta* is the main *rasa* but not the others. On this issue, Dr K.C. Pāndey says :- "These *rasās* are principal which are due to basic mental states, which lead to any one of the four recognised aims of human life. Thus *śrngāra* has *rati* as its basic mental state, which leads to the attainment of *kāma* and consequently to *dharma* and *artha; raudra* springs from *krōōdha* and leads to *artha, vīra* is based upon *utsāha* and leads to *dharma* and *artha, śānta* is based upon *tattvajñana* and leads to *mōksa.* These four, therefore, are the principal *rasas* Though occasionally they may be found to occupy a subordinate position, yet it is an undeniable fact that there are dramas in which each of them is separately found to be the principal. As *rasa* etc. do not independently lead to any *purusārtha,* but do so only as parts of *rati* etc., they are recognised to be subordinate."[17]

This view is based upon the authority of Abhinavagupta's commentary on the Nātyasāstra. [18] Indian Ālankārika tradition certainly supports it inasmuch as the aesthetic experience is conducive to the attainment of the fourfold value of human life.[19] But the inclusion of *raudra* instead of *karuna* in the list of the main *rasās* appears to be rather strange. Even admitting that the experience derived from a *kāvya* leads to the attainment of the fourfold aim of human life, why should *karuna* be removed from the rank of the principal *rasās*? How does *karuna* fail where *'śṛngāra, vīra, raudra* and *'sānta* succeed? It is an historical fact that all the greatest epics of the world have only *karuna* as the principal *rasa* If its is contended that they do not help to attain the aims of human life, then the Rāmāyaṇa also should be debarred from the class of the Mahākāvyas. Since such a position is obviously untenable, *karuṇa* also has to be considered one of the principal *rasās*.

Now the question arises - why should Viśvanātha explicitly ordain that only one of the three, *'śṛngāra vīra* and *sānta,* be the principal *rasa ?* Everything must have a cause, however irrational it may apper to be. It is not very difficult to find it out. Bhamaha and Dandin specifically mentioned that the story of a Mahakavya should be one of happy and prosperous ending. Taking this tip, Viśvanātha might have excluded *karuna* from the principal *rasās.* The reason for the omission of *raudra may* be that particular experience will not be so comprehensive as those of the other principal *rasās* The next question why one *rasa* should be the main and the others its subordinates, can be easily answered. As the poem is to be an organic whole, various *rasās* are also to be harmonised; otherwise it will either read like a number of episodes or become utterly ineffective. As regards the twenty-six elements to be described, Alankarikas themselves have admitted that they are not invariable conditions which a Mahakavya has to satisfy. Rājaśēkhara in his Kāvyamīmāmsa quotes Aparājiti's opinion which says that the effort the poet puts in to describe rivers, mountains, seas, cities, horses, elephants etc. suggests only the power and fame of the poet but bears no

other fruit, and hence it is not very pleasing to the widely cultured[2c]. Another point to be noted in this connection is that a Mahākāvya should give as comprehensive an experience as is possible without jeopardising the unity and the total effect, and that the prose of those times was not yet cut off from the moorings of word-music which plays a very important role in poetry. To present a comprehensive experience of feudal times naturally means the presentation of the ways of cities, diplomacies, travels, wars, glories of the princes, etc. And, since a Mahākāvya is mainly a narrative poem, and realistic prose of modern times was still in a germinal stage, it had in those times probably no other alternative than to depend upon descriptions of the objects mentioned by the Alankarikas. That is perphaps why any Mahākāvya of feudal ages worth the name invariably dealt, though not with all, at least with a majority of those items. What appears to be at the back of their minds is that a Mahākāvya should convey a wider and more effective experience. If that is there, even a poem 10 which does not deal with any of the items mentioned above, can be a Mahākāvya.

The next question which requires attention is the hero. The Ālankārikās, as it has been observed, insist upon selecting either a divine person or a progeny of the princely class endowed with the qualities of *dhīrodātta* as the hero of the Mahākāvya When literally understood, this rule will appear to be inappropriate. When strictly followed, it implies that there cannot be great men born in families of average or below average means. History, especially of modern times, cries itself hoarse against it. The second point that the hero must be a *dhīrodātta,* cannot be easily ignored or refuted, because, the principal *rasa* is either *śṛṅgāra,* or *vīra,* or *karuṇa,* or *santa* Even if one should deny this, one cannot gainsay that, whatever may be the actual theme, the suggested experience must be of profound significance. When this is lacking, the *kāvya,* though it fulfils all the other conditions ordained by the Alankarikas, cannot be a Mahakavya Why then did the Alankarikas definitely insist on the hero of a Mahakavya being one of the princely class? The answer seems to rest on their belief in the life of *Varṇāśrama dharma* based upon Indian Philosophy.

On the next question regarding the magnitude of the poem, Viśvanātha was the only Ālankārika to maintain that it should have more than eight cantos. On what basis he fixed this number, one has no information. Granting that all the five *Sandhis* have to be incorporated, the Mahakavya may be finished in five or even in three cantos. To exclude such a poem from the class ofMahākāvya simply on the basis of the number of cantos in it is perhaps ridiculous. In this connection it may be noted that the lower limit fixed for the Nataka is five Acts Since a Mahākāvya is nothing but a Nātaka in narrative form with descriptions strewn here and there, and since these descriptions naturally require more length, did Viśvanātha fix the lower limit of the latter as nine? Even then, it cannot be disproved that this limit is arbitrary. Speaking on the same point of magnitude, Aristotle in his Poetics writes:- "To be beautiful, a living creature, and every whole made up of parts, must not only present a certain order in its arrangement of parts, but also be of a certain definite magnitude. Beauty is a matter of size and order, and therefore impossible either (1) in a very minute creature since our perception becomes indistinct as it approaches instantaneity, or (2) in a creature of vast size - one, say, 1000 miles long - as in that case, instead of the object being seen all at once, the unity and wholeness of it is lost to the beholder. Just in the same way, then, as a beautiful whole made up of parts, or a beautiful living creature, must be of some size, a size to be taken in by the eye, so a story or a plot must be of some length, but of a length to be taken in by the memory. As for the limit of its length, so far as that is relative to public performances and spectacles, it does not fall within the theory of poetry."[22] That the canto of a Mahakavya must be composed in one single metre except at the end, and that there may be one canto in different metres, perhaps refer more to the tradition prevalent with the Sanskrit poets than to aesthetic necessity. It may be argued here that changing metres so often in one and the same context, mood and situation will not be conducive to the realisation of the peculiar experience, and as examples, the great epics of the English and the Greeks may be cited[23]. Even Aristotle's discussions on the appropriate metre for the epic

may be quoted at length from the Poetics. "As for its (epic) metre, the heroic has been assigned it from experience; were any one to attempt a narrative poem in some one or in several, of the other metres, the incongruity of the thing would be apparent. The heroic in fact is the gravest and weightiest of metres - which is what makes it more tolerant than the rest of strange words and metaphors, that also being a point in which the narrative form of poetry goes beyond all others. The iambic and trochaic, on the other hand, are the metres of moment, the one representing that of life and action, the other, that of the dance. Still more unnatural would it appear, if one were to write an epic in a medley of metres, as Chaeremon did. Hence it is that no one has ever written a long story in any but heroic verse; nature herself, as we have said, teaches us to select the metre appropriate to such a story."[24]

In fact, one has to admit the intrinsic value of the metre in suggesting a tone, feeling, emotion, etc; but this does not rule out the efficacy of other media in carrying out the same function. If the latter is denied, there cannot be a Mahakavya in prose, or as a matter of fact, there cannot be even plurality of Fine Arts. This sort of argument is presumably as fallacious as that of the modern critics who advocate complete exclusion of metre of any kind from drama. So the rule mentioned by Visvanatha might be taken as referring to the tradition followed by the Sanskrit poets, but not perhaps as a universal principle to be strictly followed. The last point that the story to be continued in the succeeding canto should be indicated towards the close of the preceding is important, and needs no further elucidation because a Mahākāvya is an organic whole, and, as such, the preceding part must naturally anticipate the succeeding.

Now with these principles of a Mahakavya in view, one has to examine the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and see whether it has any unique qualities. Before this question is taken up, it is not altogether unimportant for one to know the story first and then settle the problems connected with the theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam in so far as they have immediate bearing on the subject of this essay.

CHAPTER II

THE STORY OF THE KALĀPŪRNŌDAYAM IN OUTLINE

When *Krṣṇa* was ruling his kingdom from Dvāraka, there lived in that city a maiden named Kalabhāsini. She was born in a courtezan family and was taught all the fine arts befitting her station. Her beauty was marvellous and her disposition sweet. One day, as she was swinging along with her friends in a twig-made cradle of flowers, Manikandhara a disciple of Nārada, following his *guru* on his aerial path to Dvāraka, saw her. Smitten by her beauty and unable to control himself, he expressed his opinion to Nārada that it surpassed even the beauty of the celestials. The divine seer readily endorsed it without any reservation.

Just at that time Rambha, travelling with Nalakūbara in an aeroplane above them, happened to overhear their conversation. Nāradā's open approval of his disciple's statement wounded her pride in her beauty. What could she do when the divine seer himself more than endorsed it?

Now her only desire was to make Nārada openly admit the superiority of her own beauty. With this end in view, she paid homage to the *ṛsi*, and invited him and his disciple into her plane. Nārada blessed the divine couple that their mutual love would prosper for ever. This gave her an opportunity to let him know her mind. In mild sarcasm she asked him how his benediction would bear fruit when there were more beautiful girls on earth than she. Nārada was not so slow - witted as not to grasp the sting; nor was he a person to tolerate such impudence, Immediately he retorted with a sardonic laughter :- "Oh! grand beauty, don't think time will always be bounteous. Who knows what is in the womb of the future? When a man having exactly the likeness of your lover and a woman that of yours come into existence, nobody can reckon the agony that will come upon you both". Realising the implied curse, Rambha with a promptness that was hers became all humility, bowed low to him and bade him adieu.

Kalabhāṣiṇi, who overheard this conversation, followed the plane of Rambha and Nalakūbara then flying at a very low level. When she could no longer follow it, she walked towards Nārada who had by then got down to the earth. She was impressed by the beauty of Nalakūbara, and felt that she had fallen in love with him. With the help of the great seer she wanted to win him over to herself. Prompted by this secret longing, she approached Narada, and paid her obeisance. During the conversation that followed, the seer told her, God willing, she might really become Rambha's rival. Then he recollected that she was a regular visitor to the court of Kṛṣna, and that she was the very maiden who had repeated the whole poem of *dandaka* composed by Maṇikandhara in praise of Kṛṣṇa after its very first recital. With a profundity too deep for their line to fathom, he got her to repeat the poem once again. She requested him to accept her as his disciple and bestow on her the honour of carrying his *vīna* into the harem. To this he readily agreed. Manikandhara, guessing that she was seeking private audience with the seer, betook himself out of earshot: Approaching Narada she requested him to enlighten her with the story of Kalāpūrna which had cropped up in the conversation between Rambha and Nalakūbara. The divine seer informed her that he could not reveal the story as it would spell mortal life, long and prosperous to one who did it. This information given, they departed to meet once again in the court of Krsna.

SECOND CANTO

The main object of Nārada's regular visits to Kṛṣna was to study music and become a master in that art. Along with Kalabhāṣiṇi he continued his studies first under the wives of Kṛsṇa, and then directly under the Lord Himself. During this whole course, Maṇikandhara would wait for his *guru* outside the gate because he had no access to the harem. Within a few years Nārada became so proficient in that art that all the wives of Kṛṣṇa paid him their highest tributes. By the grace of the Lord, Manikandhara also became as proficient in that art as Nārada and Kalabāṣini though he had no opportunity to study along with them. After taking leave of Krsna, Nārada was on his way back

followed by his two disciples. At that time he expressed his doubts to them as to the sincerity of the compliments paid by the wives of Kṛṣṇa. Kalabhasini told her *guru* that she would have found out their real opinion if she had the power to assume the form of anyone of the ladies in waiting. The seer, reading her desire to acquire the necessary power to meet her supposed lover, Nalakūbara, determined to bring about that mischief. So he readily conferred on her the power of assuming any form she liked. Obtaining this power from him, she went into the harem and returned almost immediately to tell her *guru* that all those compliments were offered in sincerity. Pleased with this service, the divine seer blessed her that she would meet her lover whom she sincerely loved from the very beginning, and departed from her accompanied by his second disciple.

Thus her visits to the court having come to close, Kalabhāsini was in an indolent mood. Her thoughts once again flew back to Nalakūbara. How ever hard she tried, she could not wean her mind from him. There appeared no way for her to meet her supposed lover. Time was hanging heavy. One evening, while she was brooding over her love in her garden, a *siddha* named Manistambha alighted there with his lion from the aerial path. To her great surprise, he addressed her by her ṇame, enquired after her health and her love for Nalakūbara. He explained to her the object of his visit. Good music was his meat and drink. Before he met Kalabhāsiṇi his faculty of clairaudience nourished him with Maṇikandhara's music. Because Maṇikandhara was occupied with his penance, he was denied the opportunity to hear his soul-moving music. So Maṇistambha requested her to entertain him with her art. In her curiosity to know the later history of Maṇikandhara on the one hand, and to ascertain his supernatural powers on the other, she requested him to tell her how Manikandhara happened to undertake penance.

The *siddha* narrated what Nārada had told Manikandhara before his final departure. The divine seer became envious of Tumbura's musical faculty. His proficiency was so great that Narada performed severe penance and obtained a boon from Viṣṇu.

He was to be trained in that art by Kṛṣṇa. That was why Nārada continually visited him for so many years. After giving an account of his visits, Nārada advised his disciple, Maṇikaṅdhara, to dedicate his musical talent to the service of the Lord, to go on a pilgrimage and then to perform penance. Following this advice Maṇikaṅdhara visited various holy places and then took to penance.

This account given by Maṇistambha was confirmed by a parrot perching on the branch of a tree near by. It informed Kalabhāṣiṇi that it had come from heaven, and that Indra had sent Rambha to Maṇikaṅdhara with the sole purpose of preventing him from carrying on his penance. After giving this news, the bird took leave of her and flew away on her own mission.

THIRD CANTO

Rambha proceeded to Maṇikandhara's hermitage with her attendants as directed by Indra and very soon managed to ensnare him with her beauty. In the meanwhile, Maṇistambha, who was being entertained by Kalabhāṣiṇi, informed her at her request how Maṇikandhara had become a victim to Rambha, and how he had to part from her owing to her unconscious reference to Nalakūbara in her concubinal ecstasy. Being pressed further by her, the *siddha* told her that Nalakūbara was waiting for his beloved Rambha in the outskirts of Maṇikandhara's hermitage, and laughed at her because the sole cause of her enquiry was her anxiety to know the whereabouts of Nalakubara. When the *siddha* was about to leave Kalabhāsini, she pressed him to take her on his lion to her supposed lover[25].

Pretending hesitation a while, he put her on the lion and started on his aerial journey. When they reached the neighbourhood of the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana, the lion refused to go forward. He whipped it hard, but it did not budge even an inch. Kalabhasini became nervous. By way of explanation the *siddha* told her that there was the temple of Mrgēndravāhana near by and that no lion dared to move around or above the lion of the goddess. He informed her that it would be better for them to wor-

ship the goddess and then proceed towards their destination. They got down and left the lion to seek its prey. Manistambha asked her to wait for him at the temple and left her for a while promising to bring flowers for worship. There at the temple, she met a very old and fragile lady, who, to her great horror and consternation, informed her that the *siddha* was a cruel man, and that he had brought her there only to sacrifice her to the goddess. Sumukhāsatti, for that was the name of the old lady, advised her to make good her escape before he returned to the temple. This news came as a bold from the blue. What was her object, and what was she going to meet with? How could she escape now from one who had the supernatural powers of clairvoyance and clairaudience? Resigning herself to fate, she read the edicts on the pillar. She was now quite certain that she was about to be killed. To acquire a vast empire he was going to sacrifice her to the goddess.

Manistambha, having returned with flowers, asked Kalabhāṣini to follow him into the inmost sanctuaries of the temple. Apprehensive of her coming death, she requested the old woman to accompany her. Immediately the *siddha* guessed that the old woman had revealed to her everything. Losing no time, he caught Kalabhāsiṇi by her hair and began to drag her to the presence of the goddess. Her bitter wailing and despondent appeal moved the old woman to the core, and she forbade him to kill her in the name of the goddess. Not heeding this, he was about to strike when Sumukhāsatti offered her own head. He cut it off, and then raised his sword once more to strike. Before the blow came down, the *siddha* and Kalabhāsini were flung away far, far into the lap of distance. [17]

Sumukhāsatti was resuscitated in a new body, beautiful and young. Once again she began her *yogic* practice. As this was going on, one day, Kalabhasini returned to the temple, and asked her who she was. What was her surprise when she heard that the young woman was none other than Sumukhāsatti! Just at that time Manikaṅdhara also arrived at the temple with his musical instrument on his shoulder. As he saw Kalabhāṣiṇi, his

G. V Krishna Rao

heart leapt into his mouth because after such a long time he was able to meet his co-disciple, whom he had never expected to see any more. With overflowing emotion he enquired after her welfare and the cause of her appearance at that place. Kalabhāṣiṇi with an equal ardour told him how she had been brought to the temple by Maṇistaṁbha, and how Sumukhāsatti had offered her life to save her. At this juncture, Maṇistaṁbha also appeared on the scene, and learnt after enquiry who the young and beautiful lady was. Pressed for his later history, he gave the following account :-

Thrown far by the goddess, both Maṇistaṁbha and Kalabhāṣiṇi fell on a flowery bed in the vicinity of Maṇikaṅdhara's hermitage. When he got over this shock, he saw by his side Kalabhāṣiṇi with her frame slightly quivering and yet most alluring. Unable to control his passion for the quivering beauty beside him, he tried to embrace her. To escape from this molestation, 18 she cried aloud for help; and help came from Nalakūbara who was not very far off. While the *siddha* was running for his life at the unexpected turn of events, Nalakūbara caught him and demanded that he should be shown where the lady was. As Maṇistaṁbha was being dragged back to the flowery bed, Rambha appeared on the scene, released him and led Nalakūbara into a bower near by. The *siddha,* who could not afford to lose his sword that had fallen into the hands of Nalakūbara, waited for an oportunity to regain it.

As their dalliance was going on, another Rambha made her appearance. Nalakūbara was so puzzled that he could not know who the real Rambha was. Presently there ensued a truculent quarrel between the two women. Nārada, who was ever on the watch for such situations, appeared on the scene, enjoyed the quarrel to his heart's content, and left the place without explicitly revealing their respective identities. To regain her lover, the second Rambha tried to force the first to follow her to the court of Indra. But the first Rambha swore in the name of Nalakūbara that she would not step into that court, whereupon the second Rambha sneered at her saying that it was but a trick to hide her

inability to take the aerial path. This clue opened the eyes of Nalakūbara; he was now able to recognize the real Rambha, and so proceeded to punish the impostress most violently while the true Rambha cursed her that she would be put to the sword in the near future.

While the real Rambha was enjoying Nalakūbara's company, there appeared another Nalakubara on the scene and raised a quarrel. Maṇistaṁbha, who was watching these bewildering events, was unable at first to believe his own senses. But the fight between the two Nalakūbaras was so fierce that he could not but believe at length what was going on under his very nose. Very soon Rambha parted them, and taking them aside one after another, questioned them when Kalapurna's story was referred to. The first Nalakūbara could not tell her, whereas the second could. Thereupon she left the impostor in disgust and joined her real lover. The aggrieved Nalakūbara cursed the impostor that he would meet his death soon. Maṇistambha did not know where the impostor went, but the celestial couple returned to heaven. The *siddha* took the sword left in the bower by the impostor and returned to the temple.

After narrating these incidents, Maṇistambha requested Kalabhāsiṇi to relate to him what befell her after she left the flowery bed.

FOURTH CANTO

To their great surprise, Kalabhāsiṇi disclosed to her auditors that she was the very impostress, and explained to them how she was able to assume that form by virtue of the boon she had obtained from Nārada. Now her only sorrow was, she told them, that her chastity had been violated by some other person than Nalakūbara. When she was about to say something more, Maṇikaṁdhara came out with his confession. He was the person who dallied with her in the form of Nalakūbara and later on received a curse from the celestial lover. He recalled their earlier asociations. Since their first meeting he had loved Kalabhāṣiṇi,

but he was prevented from expressing his love for fear of Nārada's resentment. He was very happy to have been united with her. When she heard it, Kalabhāṣiṇi's joy knew no bounds because she was united with Maṇikaṅdhara whom she had loved from the very beginning. Explaining this and the psychic phenomena that led her to believe that she was in love with Nalakūbara, she told them that none would believe it to be true because firstly, she came from the courtezan class, and secondly, her attachment to Nalakūbara was as clear as day-light.

Her obvious sincerity, candour and veracity roused the true lover in Maṇikaṅdhara. He consoled her saying that he truly believed her words and even reminded her of tthe parting words of Nārada as a proof of the truth of her statement. In addition, he gave the following account in support of the validity of the psychic process which she described as having personally undergone.

Before he became the disciple of Nārada, Maṇikaṅdhara propitiated Mṛgēndravāhana and acquired the poetic gift. To get that new power tested by the literary critics of Kashmir, he visited that country and stayed with a Brāhmin. Just at that time there came the news that Sālīna and Sugātri were drowned in the lake, Satatāladaghna. He asked his host who they were and he gave the following story.

In that Sāradāpītha there was a priest who had an only daughter named Sugātri. Owing to unknown causes the father left the family and disappeared. Where he went, and what became of him, nobody knew. When the girl came of age, she was married to an apparently docile and pliable youth called Sālīna, who was required to live with his mother-in-law and his wife. On the first night of their meeting, Sugātri was gorgeously decorated and sent into the nuptial chamber. Sālina, who had no attraction for jewellery or colourful finery did not care even to look at his wife but sank into a deep sleep in utter indifference. Thus night after night passed with no ray of conjugal love touching the full bloom of her maidenhood.

This indifference on the part of Salina created difficulties for him. The mother-in-law, who was eager to have grandchildren, was very disappointed, and began to dislike him. She even imposed on him such menial tasks as watering her garden. This humiliating treatment given to her husband by her mother pained Sugātri very much. She could neither endure it nor put up an open fight with her mother. The second course would naturally make her family affairs the town talk. As days passed by, Sugātri could no longer sit idle at home, while her husband was working hard in the garden. Without informing her mother she went there, hid her jewels safe in some place and began to help her husband in watering the plants. With this physical labour she was exhausted. She was profusely perspiring and her breasts were gently rising and falling. Sālīna coud no longer be indifferent to her quivering beauty and at once took her into his arms. Within two days Sugātri came to understand her husband's temperament. he did not like anything but quivering beauty. While they were thus living happily, one day Sālīna got angry with his wife and threw himself into the lake, Satataladaghna, and died.

After narrating this story, Manikandhara asked Sumukhāsatti whether she did not know the heroine as she claimed that country as her native land. With a sweet smile on her face she told them that she was that very Sugātri. Great was their surprise to hear this news. This was doubled when Maṇistaṁbha came out with the confession that he was the very Sālīna. Naturally this led to the question of identification. Because both Sumukhāsatti and Manistaṁbha gave the same cause for their dispute, Manikandhara declared them to be really husband and wife.

While Sumukhāsatti was feeling grieved over Manikandhara's curse, Kalabhāsini asked him why he was not able to tell Rambha that the reference to the story of Kalāpūrna was made in the neighbourhood of Dvāraka. Maṇikaṁdhara replied to her that he had never heard of it. Then remembering that he was not with Narada when she asked the seer about it, she told him what she had heard from her *guru*. Alaghuvrata, a

Malayāli Brahmin, who had come there to seek his fortune and having heard from Kalabhāṣiṇi that by coming to know the story of Kalāpūrṇa one would acquire wealth and enjoy a long and prosperous life. etc., sat down to do penance with the object of coming to know the story by the grace of Mṛgēndravāhana.

In the meanwhile, Kalabhāṣiṇi begged Maṇistaṁbha to sacrifice her to the goddess and thus obtain his wish. He refused to comply with her request expaining that he would not dare to raise his sword once again against her as he was forbidden to do it in the name of the goddess. Since his sword was sure to kill her sooner or later, she entreated Manikaṅdhara to sacrifice her, and thus obtain a vast empire. Persuaded from all quarters, Maṇikaṅdhara after long hesitation offered her to the Goddess. Because he hesitated, he was told by the goddess, that he would acquire the empire only in his next birth. In the meanwhile Kalabhāsiṇi woke up unhurt and found herself in her garden in Dvaraka. Maṇikaṅdhara hid his sword and *vina* in the temple, presented the *maṇihāra* to Alaghuvrata and went to the Srisaila with the object of throwing himself into the valley and thus court death.

Sumukhāsatti and Maṇistambha stayed there for some time carrying on *yogic* practice, and later on set out on their lion to visit various places of interest.

FIFTH CANTO

By the end of the second year of Alaghuvrata's penance, he was flung far into the air by the goddess along with his *maṇihāra*. When he regained his consciousness and opened his eyes, he found himself in the full court of a king. There was a baby in the cradle before the ruler. Alaghuvrata bowed low to the king and presented him with the *maṇihāra*. The king in his turn presented it to the baby. No sooner had the central gem touched the heart of the baby, than it laughed and said that it was happy to see it once again after two years. Every one in the court was taken by surprise. The king in his curiosity and wonder questioned it where and how it had seen it when it was hardly two months old. While the audience listened with rapt attention, the baby narrated the following :-

Originally it was the pet parrot of Sarasvati and Caturmukha. Once Brahma was dallying with Sarasvati in their garden near a lake. Although she was truly happy, she tried to hide her pleasure by pretending to be offended with her husband. Brahma, at this turn of events, asked the parrot in the cage near by to tell him a story. The parrot, however, pleading her inability, requested him to tell one himself, whereupon he gave the following.story :-

In the city of Kāsārapura there lived a king named Kalāpūrṇa. His father was Sumukhāsatti, a woman, and his mother was Maṇistaṁbha, a man. As soon as he was thus born, he became a youth and was presented by a *siddha* named *Svabhāva* with a jewel, a bow and arrows, all invested with supernatural powers. He conquered Madāśaya, another king, and made him his vassal. His minister Satvadātman, made him the anointed king of Angadēśa. Attracted by the jewel, the four Agamas, the *purōhits* of Madāśaya, attended upon him. Once it so happened that one of the four Āgamās offended the king by fondling the jewel too much; and as a consequence, all of them were driven out. Madāśaya also left the court along with his queen, Rūpānubhūti and his baby, Madhuralālasa, only to return after some time. When Madhuralālasa, came of age, she was given in marriage to Kalāpūrna.

Sarasvati, who was all the while carefully following the story, embraced her husband and asked him whether it was not an account of their love narrated in the form of a story. In spite of his smiling denials, he had to admit the truth when she came out with her lucid comment.

Sometime after this event took palce, Rambha came to the world of Brahma to pay her homage to Sarasvati. Just at that time the parrot was repeating the *maṇita* that emanated from the throat of Sarasvati. The sensual woman that she was, Rambha came to know everything that had happened between Sarasvati and Chaturmukha through the innocent creature. Sarasvati

G. V. Krishna Rao

happened to overhear the parrot imparting her secrets of love, and cursed that it might be born as an unchaste woman among mortals. Brahma, who came there, consoled the poor creature with the blessing that she would in her subsequent life be born as Madhuralālasa and marry Kalāpūrṇa and be famed for a chaste wife. He warned Rambha that the revelation of the story of Kalāpūrṇa would confer upon the narrator and the auditor mortal life, long and prosperous. That very parrot was born as Kalabhasini in Dvaraka and saw the *maṇihara* with Maṇikaṅdhara.

Then Alaghuvrata requested the baby to tell him where he could see the king Kalāpūrṇa. It directed him to get the information from the audience. The king at once told him that he was Kalāpūrṇa, and then introduced Satvadatman, Madāśaya, Rūpānubhūti and the four Āgamās. He also informed him that the baby was the daughter of Madāśaya and Rūpānubhūti.

Requested once again by Alaghuvrata to be enlightened on the question of Kalāpūrṇa's supernatural birth, the baby narrated the following events.

At her husband's request, Sumukhāsatti exchanged her sex with her husband by virtue of the boon she obtained from Mṛgeṅdravāhana. In that state Kalāpūrna was born to them, and at once he became a youth. Satvadatman abdicated his throne in favour of that superman to absolve himself of the crime of unjustified advances of love he made to Sumukhāsatti.

Svabhāva was no other person than the father-in-law of Maṇistaṁbha. It was he who gave his son-in-law the lion and the sword. After having practised *yōga* for a long time in the depths of the Satatāladaghna, he emerged from it and reached the Srīsaila. There he met Maṇikaṅdhara who was about to throw himself down into the valley. Learning from him his personal story and promising to give him a jewel, a bow and arrows which would bestow victory and prosperity, Svabhāva dissuaded Manikaṅdhara from courting death in that manner.

SIXTH CANTO

When Maṇikandhara was at the śrīsaila, Abhinavakaumudi, an *apsarasa* maiden, came running towards him, gave him a miraculous sword and requested him to save her from Salyāsura who was pursuing her. Courageous as he was, he had a terrible fight with the demon which resulted in each slaying the other. Maṇikandhara, who died in that fight, was subsequently born as Kalāpūrṇa; and Abhinavakaumudi married him in accordance with her oath.

Once again requested by Alaghuvrata, the baby told him his past history describing the loss of his property, the parting from his wives, the birth of the four Āgamās and their entry into the service of Madāśaya. Now Satvadatman approached the baby for information regarding his antecedents which he was quite unable to remember. The central gem of the *maṇihara* falling off her heart, the baby lost her supernatural powers and began to weep. No one was able to know the cause of this sudden change. Kalāpūrna, promising to marry her, ásked her parents to bring her up with proper care.

SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CANTOS

As years passed by, Madhuralālasa, as that was the name of that baby, grew up into a young and beautiful maiden and was married to Kalāpūrna. Later on the king, to keep up his word given to his two wives, undertook an expedition of conquest and vanquished all the kings. Abhinavakaumudi was presented with the *vīna* and Madhuralālasa with a pair of anklets studded with the crown-jewels of all the princes. When Satvadatman came with that present and was about to bow to her, Madhuralālasa protested against it and paid homage to him. She then revealed his past history to her husband.

Satvadatman's original name was Sugraha; he was the brother of Rūpānubhūti. Coming to know of his pedigree and good qualities, various kings requested him to accept their daughters as his wives. Because he did not care to reply to them, all of

them besieged his capital. Perturbed by this turn of events, he stole into the forest and performed penance as a result of which he obtained the *manihara.* Later on, however, a curse was pronounced upon him to the effect that he would forget his past history up to that event and not be recognised by other people also who knew him. He would be redeemed from his curse only when he came to know of that event. Thus he lost the *manihara* which had the power to reveal everything when its central gem touched the heart of the wearer. It first fell into the hands of a Brahmana who presented it to Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa gave it to Maṇikaṅdhara who in turn gave it to Alaghuvrata. How at length it reached Madhuralālasa was too well-known to need comment. Because the central gem fell off the heart of the baby, Madhuralālasa, she was not able to disclose Satvadatman's past history. All this, Madhuralālasa came to know only at that time.

Later on both Kalāpūrṇa and Madhuralālasa utilised the maṇihāra to know not only Maṇikaṅdhara's poem *Laksmīnārāyana Samvāda* but also the social and political conditions of their kingdom as they really were. The monarch begot two sons Suprasāda and Sarasa by his wives Abhinavakaumudi and Madhuralālasa respectively. Thus he lived a long and happy life with no longing unsatisfied and with nothing to crave for.

CHAPTER III

THE SO - CALLED SOURCES

Before proceeding to enquire into the merits and demerits of Kalāpūrṇodayam as a *Mahakāvya,* it is necessary to examine whether its theme is original or borrowed. An answer to this question is of great importance to the subject of this essay. If it can be proved and established that the poem has a veritable source, the purport and significance of the poem can be determined by the aim and object of the source. If the poet has made alterations and changes in the events borrowed, his object in making them becomes esay to discover. If, on the contrary, the poem proves to be original through and through, its significance and purport is to be arrived at purely on the basis of internal evidence. When this question of sources is answered satisfactorily, the problem where one should inquire for its purport becomes simplified. In this connection there appears to be some confusion between a source and an influence. A clear idea about them may make the problem simpler. So it may be roughly defined for this purpose that anything which is to be considered a regular source must provide more than one incident, or episode, or character, or outlook. If none of them can be traced back, then surely one is at liberty to conclude that there is no source. If such be the nature of a source, it goes without saying that a literary work whose value depends entirely on its organic unity cannot be said to have a number of sources. If many works appear to claim it, it seems appropriate to regard them more as influences than sources. Viewed from this angle, how far can the works mentioned by critics be considered sources of the Kalapurnodayam ?

Mr. Achuta Rāo[26], Pandit Sri Duvvūri Venkataramana Sāstri[27] and others mention the Kādambari, the Prabōdhacandrōdayam, the Lingapurāṇam, the Manucaritram, the Sri-kāla-hasti-mahātmyam, the Parijātāpaharaṇam, the Markandēyapurāṇam, the Āscaryacūdamaṇi of Saktibhadra, the

Mahābhārata, the Sētubandha and the Āmuktamālyada as sources. There are one or two critics like Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyaṇa Sastri who completely deny that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam[29] has any source. But the main question is whether anyone of the works mentioned above is to be considered a source, and if so to what extent.

This inquiry may be started with Bāṇa's Kādambari which is an adaptation of the story of Sumanas to be found in Sōmadēva's Kathāsaritsāgara. Sūdraka, the King of Vidiśa, received one day a parrot named Vaisampāyana, well-versed in all the sciences from a *mātanga kanya.* Greeted by Vaisampāyana in human tongue, the king became curious and solicited the parrot for its story. Explaining to the king how it lost its father and was saved by the son of Jābāli, it gave the following account of its past history as heard from Jābāli narrating it to the sages.

Tārāpīḍa, the King of Ujjayini, and his minister, Sukanāsa, were after a long time blessed with the birth of sons called Candrāpīḍa and Vaiśampāyana. In due course these two boys received education appropriate to their status and grew into tall and sturdy youths. When Candrāpīḍa attained proper age, he was anointed as the crown prince, whereupon he started on an expedition of world conquest along with his friend, Vaiśampāyana. Towards the close of this campaign the crown prince, mounted his invincible horse, Indrayudha, and followed by his friend and the army, reached Kailāsa. One day while he was resting there with his friend and army, he was attracted by a *kinnara* couple and pursued it on his horse. Thus led on, he reached at last the hermitage of Mahāsvēta, an extremely beautiful maiden, who had taken to austerities of penance. To his great relief, he received hospitality at her hands and so requested her to enlighten him with her story.

Modest and good-natured, Mahāsvēta told him about her terrible misfortune. She was the only daughter of the *gāndharva* couple, Hamsa and Gauri. One day she happened to meet Pundarīka, the son of a sage, when she went to the lake of Acchōda

to bathe. He was so handsome that Mahāśvēta could not but fall in love with him. With great difficulty she left her lover, and went home only to hear from Kapiñjala, the friend of her lover, that love-sickness had so effected his friend that he was in danger of life. By the time she reached him, Pundarīka was no more. When she was making preparations to commit *sati*, a divine being came down and carried away Pundarīka's body into the moon giving her definite instructions not to die. She was also promised reunion with her lover. Kapiñjala, who was on the scene, could not stay behind ; and so he followed the divine person. After this terrible event Mahāśvēta, losing all other interests and values of life, took to penance. Kādambari, the intimate friend of Mahāśvēta, and only daughter of Citraratha, coming to know of this tragic fate took a vow not to marry so long as the sorrow of her friend continued. Mahāśvēta was requested by Citraratha to dissuade his daughter from carrying out this oath.

Mahāśvēta, taking Candrāpīda with her, went to Kādambari on this mission. At first sight both candrāpīda and Kādambari fell in love with each other. After spending some days there, Candrāpīda took leave of Kadambari and reached Mahāśvēta's hermitage. Meanwhile his army was awaiting him, and before long he got a letter from his father asking him to return to the capital immediately. Requesting his friend Vaiśampāyana to bring the army to Ujjayini he went to the capital. Vaiśampāyana, however, did not return to the city for a long while, whereupon Chandrāpīda was requested by Sukānasa to bring back his friend.

The crown prince who was once again on his journey, met his returning army on the way and learnt that his friend had refused to come with it to the metropolis. Informing his parents and the prime minister of this news and obtaining their permission, he hastened to the hermitage of Mahāśvēta only to learn that his friend had been changed into a parrot by her curse, as she did not know who he was, for his improper behaviour. At this terrible blow Candrapida fell down dead. Just at that time Kādambari, and Patralēkha, the maid attending on the prince, appeared on the scene. Clairvoyance told Kādambari that her

lover was not dead and that she would once again live happily with him. Patralēkha, who had got on the back of Vajrāyudha, went to the moon, returned and took a deep plunge into the lake along with the horse: No sooner had this been done, than came out of the lake Kapinjala. Mahāśvēta enquired of him after her lover, and he told her the result of his efforts.

When Kapinjala reached the moon, he was told by him how puṇḍarīka before his death had cursed the moon that he would be born twice on the earth devoid of the fruits of love. The moon also in his turn had cursed Puṇḍarīka that he would undergo the same fate with him in two births in the world. To save the body of Puṇḍarīka from decay it was carried into the moon. The moon advised Kapinjala to inform Śvētakētu, the father of his friend, of this curse and get it removed. While Kapinjala was returning, a curse fell upon him that he would become a horse and serve Candrāpīḍa. He was further informed that the moon and Puṇḍarīka who had cursed each other would be born as Candrāpīḍa and Vaiśampāyana, and that he would regain his form when he plunged into water, after the death of Candrāpīda. Leaving this information with Mahāsvēta and Kādambari, Kapinjala went to Śvētakētu to devise ways and means of getting his friend, Pundarīka, released from his miserable fate as soon as possible.

Receiving no news from his son for a long time, Tarapida and Sukanasa went to Mahāśvēta with their wives and stayed with her and learnt from her of the fates of their sons. Jabāli told the sages that the parrot before them was no other person thatn Vaiśampāyana cursed by Mahāsvēta.

On hearing this whole story, Vaisampāyana regained the knowledge of his past life and his love for Mahāśvēta. The parrot became restless and wanted to see her once again. Though it was not strong enough to undertake this fight, love for Mahāśvēta would not leave it in peace. The parrot was caught on its way and brought before Sūdraka, the king. The king regained his knowledge of his past birth as Candrāpīḍa and before long he left

his unholy ghost behind only to wake up in the embrace of Kādambari. Puṇḍarīka also regaining his old form joined his sweetheart, Mahāśvēta.

This is the story of Kadambari when divested of the tilt and twist of phrase, the cadence of clause and the sonorous word-music. Now what are the common traits between the Kādambari and the Kalāpūrnōdayam ? At first sight, there seems nothing similar between these two except that in both the poems the poetic canvas extends over three births and that an extensive use of curses is made to secure unity. While Kādambari is purely a romantic story, Kalāpūrṇōdayam possesses greater human interest. The curses employed in Kādambari are rather more arbitrary and without artistic depth than those in the Telugu poem. Both these works make an extensive use of flash-back technique in presenting the story, and both are too intricate to be easily remembered. But the greatest story-teller that he is, Surana employs a large number of devices and points of technique in the narration of the story. In some parts the author of the Kalāpurṇōdayam introduces the characters like a dramatist and allows them to develop of their own accord through action and reaction, conflict and compromise; in some parts he makes one of the characters narrate the story to others; and in some, he directly takes up the threads into his own hands. This is not the method of Bāna. As Prof P.V.Kāne[30] remarks in his introduction to Kadambari, "we meet with a defect in constructive art, which is due to the device of weaving stories within stories ..... The fact that the greater part of the story is put in the mouth of a parrot is a serious drawback to the verisimilitude of the work." The learned professor rightly adds·- "Bāna seems to have had very little sense of proportion. In his descriptions of Mahāśvēta and the temple of Candika he tries the reader by dwelling too much on every detail. The patience of the reader is exhausted by the overloading of single words with epithets and of the epithets to these epithets. It sometimes so seems that the poet cares only for the gorgeous description of the evening, morning, moonrise or the limbs of the heroine and leaves the plot to take care of itself." These blemishes cannot be found in the art of Sūrana as exhibited in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.

It may be remembered in this context that the extension of the theme over three births and the utilisation of curses are in no way the innovations of Bāna They are to be found in the story of Sumanas in the Kathāsaritsāgara itself. That being so, how can anybody maintain that Sūrana borrowed these two ideas only from Bāna and not from the translations of Brhatkatha unless he has other evidences? So long as these evidences are not shown, one cannot reasonably give much weight to this statement:- "The Kādambari may have suggested to him (Sūrana) the remarkable idea of spreading the action of the story beyond a single life time of the hero and the heroine."[31]

On closer examination, some other faint resemblances, between the two poems in point of characterisation may be seen. For example, there is only one parrot called Vaiśampāyana in the Kādambari while two are introduced in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Of these two, one plays only a very minor part, whereas the other assumes the role of the heroine in later births. But introducing parrots as characters cannot be said to have been borrowed from the Kādambari since this is found even in the *purāṇas* and other earlier literature. The next vague point of similarity is Vajrāyudha, the valiant horse of Candrāpīda, which finds its distant counterpart in the lion of Maṇistambha: while the former has an important role to play, the latter has none Some resemblance more striking than those considered already is to be found between Mahāśvēta and Abhinavakaumudi. Both of them are heroines belonging to the *gāndharva* class and embodying purity itself. Their husbands die for them and they are reunited with them later on with this difference Mahasveta marries Pundarīka ater he is brought back to life, whereas Abhinavakaumudi marries Kalāpūrṇa who is born with a different body. Both these heroines are chaste and do not permit any liberty to be taken with them. But there is a certain divinity, a sweetness, a supermundane aroma about Mahāśvēta which is quite absent in Abhinavakaumudi. The latter is more of a human being than a *gandharvakanya*. Affection and tender feelings for fellowbeings are not to be found in her. If Sūrana had been in anyway influ-

enced by the Kādambari, he would not have missed this point. In short, Bāna's characters are only fanciful toy balloons let loose into the air of beautiful metaphor, simile and hyperbole, while those of Sūrana are creatures moving in human form amidst mortals. Even his *gandharvas* and *rāksasas* appear as mainly human beings with a slight supermundane tendency about them. This is not, however, to underestimate the greatness of Bana. What is meant here is that they are worlds apart, that each is unrivalled in his own field and that Kādambari cannot be considered at all a source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.

Now to continue, the Prabōdhacandrōdayam can be taken up for discussion. This work of Kṛṣṇa Misra is a drama presenting the philosophy of Advaita. Its merits are more of historic nature than of aesthetic value because it is perhaps the first of the now available Sanskrit dramas to have *sānta* as the main *rasa*. What are presented here are not characters in flesh and blood taken from society. They are mere abstractions of human passions and emotions, simple caricatures of castes and creeds. Anticipating the modern drama of ideas and problems, it depicts two kinds of conflicts, one internal and the other external. The first is delineated with great skill by showing clearly how the soul gradually overcomes the temptations and weaknesses and realises its own nature of *ānanda*. The second is developed through the fight with other schools of philosophy and religion like Buddhism, Jainism, Kapalika creed and the like. In this sphere the creative genius completely fails the dramatist because the frontal attack made against them loses the sympathy of those not inclined towards Advaita. This defect may not be evident to staunch Advaitins and to others who have no philosophical interest at all. But let it be presented to Buddhists, or Jains, or philosophers other than Advatins; and see the result. The very fact that so many dramas were written to advocate various religions and philosophies shows their unaesthetic nature. Any work of art true to its nature must attain universality, and must make the critic or *sahṛdaya* to whatever school he may belong, live again the life that is portrayed. So long as that is lacking it cannot be called a work of art.

G. V. Krishna Rao

So the Prabōdhacandrōdayam is more a propaganda than a drama[32]. Now could any student of Telugu literature think of the Kalāpūrnōdayam as having for its source Prabōdhacandrōdayam Sūrana's work, apart from its profound significance to be explained in later chapters, openly advocates Visistādvaita in many places. But does it wound or antogonise anybody? One may not be able to see eye to eye with the poet, but one has no complaint against him. Narada, Kalabhāsini, Sugātri, Sarasvati, Manistaṁbha are not caricatures but concrete, full-blooded characters. The technique, the outlook and the form Surana adopts have nothing in common with those of the Prabōdha candrōdayam. Even in point of *rasa,* tha Kalāpūrṇōdayam completely differs from the earlier work: the principal *rasa* in the former is *sṛngāra,* whereas it is just the opposite, ie. *sānta,* in the latter.

Hence, without the least hesitation, it may be affirmed that the Prabōdhachandrōdayam could not have been a source at all of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. The resemblance to be found in these two titles seems to be determined only by the preceeding words signifying the moon. In the first case the word *udaya* means only rise, but in the second it means prosperity also. Besides this, the first title has only denotative significance while the second suggests a vast world.

THE MARKANDĒYA PURĀNA

The next alleged source of the Kalāpūrnōdayam is the story of Madālasa to be found in the second and third cantos of Telugu Mārkandēya Purāṇa of Mārana. This story when briefly rendered runs as folows :- Gālava, a great sage, regularly molested by Patalaketu, a *rākṣhasa,* presented the prince Rtadhvaja with a valiant steed Kuvalaya by name, and requested him to kill the demon. The prince undertaking this mission, happened to meet this *rākṣhasa,* in the form of a bear, and pursued it. Shot by an arrow, the bear ran for its life and disappeared into a pitch-dark cave. With undaunted courage the prince entered the cave and at last reached a beautiful city.

There Ṛtadhvaja came across a lady, and silently following her, met a beautiful princess. The moment their eyes met they fell in love with each other. With the help of a lady, Kundala by name, they came to know about each other and got married by Tumburu. Later on the prince killed the *rākshasa* and carried Madālasa, the daughter of Viśvāvasu, to his capital.

Tālakētu, the brother of Pātālakētu, wanted to wreak vengeance on Ṛtadhavaja at any cost. One day when the prince reached the bank of the Yamuna on his daily routine of protecting the people, Tālakētu approached him in the form of a sage and contrived to get his necklace saying that he wanted it for performing a sacrifice. Leaving the prince in charge of his hermitage, the demon went to the prince's capital, and presenting the necklace told the king and Madālasa that Ṛtadhavaja had been killed in a flight with an enemy. On hearing this bad news Madālasa fell down dead. The old king performed the funeral rites of both his son and daughter-in-law.

Tālakētu returned to his hermitage, and thanking thé prince for his help, sent him away. On reaching the city, Rtadhvaja learned what had happened and henceforth life for him became meaningless. Stricken with grief, the prince took a vow not to marry again. As time passed on, the *nāga* Princes cultivated his friendship and began to spend most of their time in his company. Their father, Aśvatara, came to know about Rtadhavaja and wanted to make him happy. So he performed severe penance by which he got a boon from Sarasvati, the goddess of speech, whereby he became a greatly accomplished musician. With this gift in music he pleased Isvara and obtained in return Madālasa as his daughter endowed with all the knowledge of her past life and *yōga*. Asvatara arranged to invite Ṛtadhvaja to his palace and gave him back Madālasa. The prince once again began to lead a very happy life with her. She gave birth to three boys one after another whom Rtadhavaja named Vikrānta, Subāhu and Satrumardana. But from their cradle the great mother brought them up in philosophy and taught them the futility of mundane life so that they renounced the world one after another. When the

fourth son was born, the father again approached the cradle to give him a name. The mother laughed the serene laugh of a devout soul upon which he requested her to name the boy When Madālasa called him Alarka, he asked her why she called him so Thereupon she replied :-

లవధరింపు మసద్వ్యవహారమునకు
నై యొనర్తురు గాక యాహ్వాయము సార్థ
ముగ నొనర్పఁగవచ్చు నే పురుషునకును.
నీ పెట్టిన పేళ్ళును విను
నా పెట్టిన పేరువోలె నరవర సర్వ
వ్యాపి యగు పురుషునికి న
ర్థాపేతత్వంబుఁ బొందవూహింపంగన్

వ   లది యెట్లనిన

సీ   ఒక చోటి నుండి వేఱొక చోటి కరుగుట
క్రాంతి నాఁ జను నిట్టి క్రాంతి లేక
సర్వగతుండును సర్వాత్మకుఁడును సర్వ
భూతేశుఁడును నగు పురుషునకును
విక్రాంతుఁ డను పేరు విపులార్థవంతమో
వ్యర్థమో యది యావ యవధరింపు
నిరవయవుం డైన నిత్యునకు సుబాహు
నామం బొనర్చిన నగవు రాదె

గీ   యెల్ల జీవంబులందును నేక భావ
మై వెలుఁగు నాత్మునకు నెవ్వఁ డహితుఁడు హితుఁ
డనఁగ నెవఁ డెట్టి శత్రుమర్దన సమాఖ్య
కర్థగతి యిందుఁ జెప్పుమా పార్థివేంద్ర!

క.   తనయోద్దేశంబున నీ
వొనరించిన పేరు లర్థ యుక్తములే ని
త్య నిరాలంబ జ్యోతికి
సనాతనుండైన యట్టి సర్వాత్మునకున్.

వ. కావున

క. వ్యవహారార్థపు నామము
అవనీశ నిరర్థకంబు అవుటకు నొడఁబా
టవు నేని యుల్లాఖ్యయు
నవ్వఁగైకొను మపురుషార్థ మనకుము దానిన్.

On hearing her explanation the king readily admitted that the name was appropriate, but urged upon her to bring him up as a prince, and she fulfilled it.

Now what are the characteristics that are common to both the Kalapurnodayam and the story of Madalasa. Rākṣasa appearing in the form of a boar cannot be said to have been borrowed only from the Mārkandēya-purāṇa since that is seen in a number of stories in other *purāṇas*. The heroines, Madālasa and Madhuralālasa, are poles apart in temperament, character and antecedents. The former belongs to the *gandharva* class while the latter is only a human being. Their very names suggest their inherently opposite natures. That the discussion on the appropriateness of names might have inspired Sūrana to create the incident of Sarasvati and Brahma cannot be substantiated. The mention of Tumburu and the power of music also do not carry one anywhere. Hence it may not be unreasonable to say that the story of Madālasa is not a source at all of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.

There are more than three interesting episodes in the Mahābhārata in which a man or a woman changes his or her form or sex, and even bears children in some cases. One of these is to be found in the seventh canto of Araṇyaparva[33] wherein Adbhūtāgni is described as having fallen in love with the wives of the seven seers. Because of their un impeachable character he could not dare to express his feelings to them. Unable to bear the pangs of love he went into the forest. Svāhā, the daughter of Dakṣāyani, whom he had formerly refused to marry loved him so passionately that she wanted to get united to him at any cost. So she approached her lover in the form of one of the wives of the seven seers, and Adbhūtāgni could not detect her real identity.

The conversation between the two is really very interesting and provides occasion for flights of poetic imagination But how far this incident inspired Sūrana to conceive the idea of Salina loving only a certain aspect of Sugātri's beauty and of Kalabhāsiṇi approaching Nalakūbara in the form of Rambha cannot be determined. It seems, therefore, more a conjecture than an ascertainable fact.

The second episode dealing with the transformation of sex is to be found in the fourth canto of Udyōgaparvam of Tikkanā's Bhārata[34]. This tells us how Sikhandin born as a girl later on becomes a youth with the help of a *Yaksa* The other episode of all depicts how a prince becomes a princess and gives birth to a boy. These two are of minor importance when compared with the fourth episode. It runs as follows:-

King Bhangvāsana had no child for long, and so he performed a particular kind of sacrifice which was not liked by Indra As a result of this sacrifice, he had a hundred sons. The displeased Indra was waiting for a chance to give vent to his anger. One day the king went into the forest on a hunting expedition. The king of Devās by his super natural power made him lose his way in the forest. Roaming hither and thither, Bhangvāsana got tired and at last reached a lake. After his horse had drunk, he took a plunge in the water only to find himself changed into a woman. Great was his grief, and greater was his hesitation to appear before his sons and ministers in that deplorable state At last he went to the capital, left the kingdom in charge of his sons and returned to the forest once more to perform penance.

Later on, Bhangvāsana happened to live with a sage and begot once more a hundred sons He or she took them to the elder sons and ordered them to share their power and riches with their younger brothers. Dutiful sons as they were, they obeyed the order. Great was the anger of Indra who could not bear the sight of Bhangvāsana's prosperity, and he wanted to cause mischief. Disguised as a Brahmin, he approached the elder and the younger brothers in secret and sowed the seeds of mutual hatred with the result that both the parties were completely annihilated

in the end. Bhangvāsana, coming to know of their destruction, began to weep when Indra approached her and enquired for the cause as if he knew nothing at all. As she wept explaining the cause of her distress, Indra told her the truth and asked her out of sympathy to choose either the elder or the younger sons to whom he might grant life. She, without the slightest hesitation, requested him to restore the lives of the younger sons telling him that a mother's love was greater than that of the father. Pleased with this answer, Indra was prepared to grant Bhangvāsana his former sex; but she preferred to remain a woman The cause of this preference, it is said, was that in sexual intercourse the pleasure a woman attained was greater than that of a man[36].

In what way does this story concern one in his study of theKalāpūrṇōdayam? Though this incident cannot be treated as a source of the poem, there are certain similarities between the two which suggest that the former must have exercised an influence upon the latter. Just as Bhangvāsana loses his natural sex, becomes a woman and conceives, so also Maṇistambha becomes a woman and gives birth to Kalāpūrṇa. If these are the only similarities, one can no more regard this story as a source of inspiration than the three episodes mentioned already. The very reason which Bhangvāsana gave to Indra for preferring to remain a woman finds its echo in Manistambha when he says :

> అదియును గాక యంగనల కంగజసంగరకేళికా విశే
> షదశల యందు నెక్కు డట సౌఖ్యగతుల్ మగ వారికంటె నా
> కిదియు నెఱింగికో నిపు డభీష్టము గావున నిల్ల యుండఁ గో
> రెద నొక కొన్ని నాళ్ళు విహరింపుము నీవును బూరుషాకృతిన్ [37]

This probably shows that the story of Bhangvāsana had some influence on Sūrana. Moreover, by the underlined word *aṭa* in the stanza the poet appears to acknowledge indirectly his indebtedness.[38] Really one should pay a high tribute to him for his honesty and his poetic suggestivity. It may be argued that the poet did not directly name the source, but in reply to it one may refer these critics to the stanzas in which he pays his homage.

When considering the sources of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam, one cannot ignore the Liṅgapurāna in which the story of Nārada is presented. The credit of tracing this story to its source goes really to the learned pandit Sri Duvvūri Venkataramana Sāstri, who contributed an article to Bhārati[39] on this issue. In that article he says that Pingali Sūrana borrowed this incident, and, avoiding what is inappropriate, beautifully summarised this episode. He goes a step further and forecasts that the source of the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha may be discovered in any one of the *purāṇas* in the near future. As this is mainly a matter of criticism and not of astrology, one can neither deny nor affirm this conjecture. But Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyana Sāstri, replying to the above pandit in an article contributed to Bhārati[40] says :- "Even if these thirty-nine stanzas (2nd Canto Vs. 66-105) are deleted after inserting a single sentence to provide the link, the basic story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam does not suffer in the least. When such is the case, we may say that the story dealing with Nārada's confict with Tumburu in the Lingapurāṇa may be a source to the episode of Nārada in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. But by this it cannot be said that the Liṅgapūrāna is the source for the Kalāpūrnṇōdayam." He goes further and conjectures that this particular episode might have been Sanskritised from the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and inserted into the Liṅgapurāṇa. Unfortunately he does not advance any proof of his theory except that Vasucaritra was translated into Sanskrit. But this reply apparently cuts no ice. Before one pronounces his judgment on this issue, he should examine the so-called source as is found in the Liṅgapurāṇa. This story occurring in the first, second and third chapters of the latter part of the Liṅgapurāṇa runs as follows:-

"Surrounded by Devās and taking along with him the sages Kausika and others, Lord Hiranyagarbha went immediately to the world of Viṣṇu. There he saw that Lord Viṣnu was attended upon by eighty-eight thousand divine persons all *jnanayogēswarās, siddhās* and devotees of Visnu. All of them breathed piety, each having four hands bearing the symbols of Visnu. Divine lustre and purity shone about them and they were

similar to Lord Nārāyana. Waited upon by ourselves, Nārada, Sanaka and others, by various Bhutās and by the damsels of heaven, Viṣnu sat on a beautiful multicoloured seat in the divine car (*vimāna*) which was miles and miles wide. This *vimāna* was studded with beautiful gems and had a thousand gates. Lord Madhava was conducting the affairs of the world. At that time came in Brahma surrounded by Kausika and others and bowed to Him. Whereupon He talked with affection first to Kausika and then to the others in their order. When that meeting took place, there was wonderful applause. Lord Narayana told Brahma that, because the citizens of Kusasthala helped Kausika, because they heard the songs sung in praise of the Lord and thus knew completely the real nature of knowledge, those Brahmins were made *sadhyās* and that he should always grant access to other places also as it was done in bringing them to Lord Nārāyana. Then he conferred *ganādhipatya* upon Kausika. ....

At that moment approached Lakṣhmi smiling sweetly She was adorned with various beautiful ornaments. Experts in handling *vīnās* and other instruments of music sang melodiously about her. On all sides she was surrounded by billions of ladies On seeing this sight, *ganadhipās* having *bhusunḍis* and *panghās* in their hands threatened Brahma and others, and threw out the sages and the gods. All were driven out including Brahma. 41

At that juncture the great sage Tumburu was sent for; and he approached the Lord when he was in the company of Lakṣmi. He gave them a performance on his vina at the end of which he was presented with beautiful ornaments studded with various kinds of jewels and with auspicious and divine garlands. When Tumburu came out so honoured, other seers and Devās saw him. Having seen Thumburu going out thus honoured by Hari, Nārada was struck with envy and sorrow; he became almost paralysed with grief. "In what way can I get into the presence of Hari and Lakshmi? Tumburu is lucky enough to enjoy it whereas I am denied it. Away with this unlucky fool. While he was able to get into their presence, I was sent out by the Bhutās. After this disgrace, how can I live and where can I spend my days?" Thus

G V Krishna Rao

thinking, the sage began his penance, his mind fixed on Viṣṇu, and continued it for one thousand years of Devās. He was all the while thinking of the honour bestowed upon Tumburu.

Thinking of the honour earned by Tumburu and being pained by it, Nārada performed penance even giving up breathing for one thousand years of Devās. Then clairvoyance advised him to go to Gaṇabandhu, an owl, living on a mountain to the north of the Mānasa lake, immediately if he wanted to become an expert in music. He did as he was directed, and was received with great honour by Ganabandhu. Nārada told him everything and requested him to teach him music.

Gaṇabandhu told him the story of the king. Bhuvanēsa who had performed a thousand horse sacrifices and bestowed billions of cows, horses, cars, elephants, girls, clothes, etc., on Brahmins and ruled his kingdom. But the only thing he prohibited in his dominion was singing about Viṣṇu. When he came to know that a certain Brahmin named Harimitra was regularly doing it, he deprived the poor devotee of everything he had and then expelled him from his kingdom. For this misdeed Bhuvanēsa was given a terrible punishment. He had to live in a dark cave eating his own dead body and at the same time suffering from severe thirst and hunger for one whole *manvantara*. On the other hand, Harimitra was given the highest position of honour. On seeing this with his own eyes, Ganabandhu realised the importance of singing about Viṣṇu and learned it after labouring for many thousands of years. He definitely told Narada that music could not be learnt through simple penance but only through his personal instruction.

Gaṇabandhu received Nārada as his pupil and taught him everything he knew, the principles to be followed and the blunders to be avoided. After finishing his education in music Narada granted his *guru* a boon by which he would have the status of Garuda. Then Taking leave of him, he directly went to Svēta Dvīpa, the abode of Visnu, and sang before the Lord. The Lord plainly told him to approach him again when he would be born on the earth as Sri Kṛṣṇa. Only then, he was informed, he could hope to learn the fine subtleties of music and excel his rival Tumburu.

Before the time the Lord should be born, the sage visited the courts of Devās, Īswara and Brahma singing about Visṇu. Later on he visited the house of Tumburu and taking his *vīna* he played upon it only to realise the exquisite superiority of the notes emanating from it. He left the place at once and learned once again music at various places. Later on he approached Kṛṣṇa and reminded him of the promise given to him by the Lord. Kṛṣṇa asked Jāmbavati to teach him music. After being taught for a year by her, Nārada was again entrusted to Satya who instructed him in that art for another year. He was then taught by Rukmini and her attendants for three years at the end of which Kṛṣṇa personally trained him. At last he was told that he excelled Tumburu in music."

Now the question is whether this story is the source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. It is true that the incidents depicted in the part of the poem beginning with the sixty-eighth stanza and ending with the hundred and first of the second canto are to be found in this story occurring in the Lingapurāna. But can one say that this is the source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam?. Given this story, can anybody who has not read the kalapurnodayam sketch even the rough outline of the poem? So one must agree with Mr. Mallādi Sūrya nārāyana Sastri when he says that this incident in the Lingapurāṇa may be considered as a source only of Nāradā's confiect with Tumburu described in the poem but not of the whole of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. But even in admitting this, one may have his own reservation because the poet unlike other writers seems always to recognise even his minor indebtedness at least by way of suggestion. This has been pointed out before and is going to be shown hereafter when the occasion comes. In the present instance the poet openly says that this incident is his own creation when he makes Maṇikandhara say :- " It is known now by these words that you are anxious to excel Tumburu in music."[41] If it is not so, the poet could have easily omitted this statement without the slightest change of meaning. If it is his own, as he suggests, how is one to account for this parallelism ? Either the poet was not conscious of this indebtedness when he was describing the incident, or that this was purely a coincidence. Anyhow, this is only a conjecture.

Now to resume the enquiry, one critic[42] says that " there is also indubitable evidence to show that Sūrana had before him some Telugu poems also to furnish him with material for his plot by way of comparison and contrast." He mentions the Manucaritra, the Pārijātāpaharanam and the Āmuktamālyada as providing that material. To substantiate his statement in connection with the first poem he points out firstly, Varuthini getting united with the *gandharva* under a misconception; secondly, the hero being of *gandharva* class and thirdly, Manōrama being pursued by Indīvaraksa. To talk of these incidents as providing material for the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is rather strange. This critic seems to forget that the Manucaritra is only an adaptation of the story to be found in the Mārkandēyapurāna and not an original creation of Peddana. This statement is not meant to belittle this poet. What is meant is that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam owes nothing specially to Manucaritra, or to Pārijātāpaharanam, or Āmuktamālyada.

44

Another writer states that Brahma's love affair described in the second canto Sri-kāla-hastīmahatmyam of Dhūrjati[44] is a source of the Kalāpūrnōdayam. Except that the names of the hero and heroine are Brahma and Sarasvati there is not even the faintest resemblance between these two episodes. The story in the Sri-kala-hastimahatmyam only tells the reader that Brahma requested his sweetheart to assume a hundred forms, and that he lived with all of them forgetting everything with the result he begot thirty-six thousand demons. It is extremely difficult to prove that this was the source of the Kalapurnodayam.

In considering the problem of sources of the Kalāpūrnōdayam one is reminded that there are certain incidents and episodes in Kathāsaritsāgara of Sōmadēva which deserve mention Though not regular sources, they seem to have influenced the poet alike in his matter and his technique. Before one undertakes to settle the issue one way or the other, it behoves one to examine what they are.

The Kathāsaritsāgara, explaining its origin, gives the following story narrated by Siva to his beloved wife Pārvati *in camera* posting Nandin at the gate so that none may enter the private apartment[45] :-

"While Siva was thus speaking to his consort, there arrived a favourite dependent of Siva's, Puṣpadanta, the best of Ganās, and his entrance was forbidden by Nandin, who was guarding the door. Curious to know why even he had been forbidden to enter at that time without any apparent reason, Puṣpadanta immediately entered, making use of his magic power attained by devotion to prevent his being seen, and when he had thus entered, he heard all the extraordinary and wonderful adventures of the seven *Vidyādharās* being narrated by the trident-bearing God and having heard them, he in turn went and narrated them to his wife Jaya; for who can hide wealth or a secret from a woman? Jaya, the doorkeeper, being filled with wonder, went and recited it in the presence of Pārvati. How can a woman be expected to restrain her speech? And then the daughter of the mountain flew into a passion, and said to her husband, " Thou didst now tell me any extraordinary tale, for Jaya knows it also." The lord of Uma, perceiving the truth by profound meditation, thus spoke :- " Puspadaṇta, employing the magic power of devotion, entered in where we were, and thus managed to hear it. He narrated it to Jaya;no one else knows it, my beloved."

" Having heard this, the Goddess, exceedingly enraged, caused Puspadanta to be summoned, and cursed him, as he stood trembling before her saying : ' Become a mortal, thou disobedient servant.' She cursed also the Gaṇa Mālyavān who presumed to intrude on his behalf. Then the two fell at her feet together with Jaya and entreated her to say when the curse would end, and the wife of Siva slowly uttered this speech ; " A Yakṣa named Supratīka, who has been made a *pisāca* by the curse of Kubēra, is residing in the Vindhya forest under the name of Kāṇabhuti. When thou shalt see him, and calling to mind thy origin, tell him this tale : then, Pushpadanta, thou shalt be released from this curse. And when Mālyavān shall hear this tale from Kāṇabhūti, then Kāṇabhūti shall be released, and thou, Mālyavān, when thou hast published it abroad shalt be free also." Having thus spoken, the daughter of the mountain ceased, and immediately these Ganās disappeared instantaneously like flashes of lightning."

G. V Krishna Rao

Now the similarities between this tale and that of Sarasvati and Caturmukha can be easily perceived. Both Siva and Caturmukha tell tales to their wives in privacy. In the first, Puspadanta reveals it to his wife whereas the pet parrot imparts it to Rambha in the second. In both the stories the unfortunate creatures are cursed by the goddesses, Parvati and Sarasvati. But the differences are more numerous than the similarities. The episode of Caturmukha does not start with the avowed intention of telling a tale. It is only a by-product of Brahma's suppressed love; moreover, it weaves all the details of their love-making into a beautiful tale while those of Siva deal with extraneous things. Of course the object of both the heroes is only to please their sweethearts. In the episode of the Kathāsaritsāgara there is a scene of overhearing which is not to be found in the poem. The curse in the former affects three individuals whereas it affects only one in the latter. Besides this, these curses are different- one is a curse simple and pure, and the other is a blessing in disguise for mortals. Thus any number of differences and subtleties can be shown. Hence it may be said that this particular episode in the Kathāsaritsāgara is not a regular source of the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha. But when one says that this might have influenced Surana, there is no positive proof to deny it altogether.

This last statement is backed by many positive grounds of which the following is one [46]:-

Kālanēmi, a Brahmana, propitiated the goddess of fortune with burnt offerings. And the goddess being satisfied appeared in bodily form and said to him : " Thou shalt obtain great wealth and a son who shall rule the earth : but at last thou shalt be put to death like a robber, because thou hast offered flesh in the fire with impure motives."

When she had said this the goddess disappeared. Kālanēmi in course of time became very rich ; after sometime a son was born to him. He was called Sridatta. In course of time Srîdatta grew up, and though a Brahmin, he became matchless upon earth in the use of weapons, and in boxing and wrestling.

One day as he was going along, he saw in the middle of the Ganges a woman being dragged under by the stream, looking like the goddess of Fortune in the middle of the sea. And then he plunged in to pull her out of the water. Then that woman, though he seized her by the hair. sank deep in the water ; and he dived as deep in order to follow her. And after he had dived a long way, he suddenly saw a splendid temple of Siva, but no water and no waman. After beholding that wonderful sight, being wearied out, he paid his adorations to the God whose emblem is a bull, and spent that night in a beautiful garden attached to the temple. And in the morning that lady was seen by him, when she came to worship the God Siva, like the incarnate splendour of beauty endowed with all womanly perfections. And after she had worshipped the God. the moon-faced one departed to her own house, and Śrīdatta followed her. Then he saw that palace of hers resembling the city of the gods; the haughty beauty entered it hurriedly in a contemptuous manner And without deigning to address 47 him, the graceful lady sat down on a sofa in the inner part of the house, waited upon by thousands of women. And Śrīdatta also took a seat near her. Then suddenly that virtuous lady began to weep. The tears fell in an unceasing shower on her bosom, and that moment pity entered into the heart of Śrīdatta. Being strongly persuaded by him, she told him how her grandfather Bali was imprisoned, her father killed in a wrestling match by Viṣṇu and she imprisoned in that city guarded by a lion. Then she requested him : "Subdue that lion, our enemy : it was for that reason that I enticed you here. And when you have overcome him, you will obtain from him a sword named Mṛgāṅka, by virtue of which you shall conquer the world and become king." Thereupon Śrīdatta overcame in wrestling that haughty lion. He being freed from his curse assumed a human form, and out of gratitude gave his sword to the man who had put an end to his curse, and then disappeared together with the burden of the sorrow of the great Asura's daughters. Then the *daitya* maiden gave Śrīdatta a ring that destroyed the effect of poison. Then that young man, remaining there, fell in love with her. And she cunningly said

---
G. V. Kṛishna Rao

him : " Bathe in this tank, and when you dive in, take this sword to keep off the danger of crocodiles." He consented, and diving into the tank rose upon the very bank of the Ganges from which he had plunged in.

Now does not the story of Śrīdatta remind the reader of any incident in the story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam ? Has not Sālīna who plunged himself in the lake of the Satatāladaghna some thing in common with Śrīdatta who acquires a sword ? The very fact that the former reminds one of the latter shows that the poet might have been influenced by the former. If this is considered a simple coincidence, another example may be cited.

There is a story of The Unfaithful Wife in Kathāsaritsāgara.[47] It tells how the son of a merchant has to go to a forest with his wife and lead a hard life. One day he saves a maimed man from the river and gives him shelter. As days pass, his wife who happens to fall in love with the maimed man conspires with her lover and gets her husband thrown into the river The poor husband, however, manages to escape from death and stays under a tree taking rest. Then the story runs thus :-[48]

" Now it happened that at that time the king of that city had just died, and in that country there was an immemorial custom, that an auspicious elephant was driven about by the citizens, and any man that he took up with his trunk and placed on his back was anointed king The elephant wandering about came near the merchant's son and, as if he were providence-pleased with his self-control, took him up, and put him on his back. Then the merchant's son, who was an incarnation of a portion of Bodhisattva was immediately taken to the city and anointed king by the people." [49]

This incident naturally reminds one of Sugraha once again under the name of Satvadātman becoming king. Though such an incident is common to many a story in *purāṇa,* it seems better to trace it to the Kathasaritsagara because the original Paisācika text of the latter is older than the puranas and many other similar incidents are to be found therein.

There is another interesting passage in the story of Sūryaprabha telling how he attained sovereignty over the Vidyādharās.[50] One of the wives of Suryaprabha explains to the co-wives why kings marry many wives in this way:- "The good qualities of lovely women are different, varying with their native land, their beauty, their age, their gestures, and their accomplishments, so no one woman possesses all the good qualities. The woman of Karnātaka, of Lāta, of Saurāṣṭra and Madhyadēsa please by their peculiar behaviour of their various countries. Some fair ones captivate by their faces like the autumn moon, others, and others by their full breasts, round and firm like golden ewers, and others by their limbs charming in their shapeliness. One has limbs yellow as gold, another is dark like a *priyañgu,* another, being red and white, captivates the eyes as soon as seen. One is of budding beauty, another of full-developed youth, another is agreeable on account of her maturity, and distinguished by increasing coquetry. One looks lovely when smiling, another is charming even in anger, another charms with her gait resembling that of an elephant, another with swan-like motion. One, when she prattles, irrigates the ears with nectar, another is naturally beautiful when she looks at one with graceful contraction of the eyebrows. One charms by dancing, another pleases by singing, and another fair one attracts by being able to play on the lyre and other instruments. One is distinguished for good temper, another is remarkable for artfulness, another enjoys good fortune from being able to understand her husband's mind."

This passage might have inspired the poet to conceive of the peculiar erotic complex of Śalīna. This, however, cannot be positively ascertained for it is more a conjecture than a fact.

Another interesting passage is the dream of Sūryaprabha who tells it to his followers :-

"Hear the strongest, wonderful vision that I have had. I remember I saw, towards the end of last night, that we were all carried away by a great stream of water, and while we were swept away we kept dancing; we did not sink at all. Then that stream was turned back by a contrary breeze. Then a certain man of

fiery brightness drew us out and threw us into the fire, and we were not burnt by the fire. Then a cloud rained a stream of blood, and that blood filled the whole sky; then my sleep came to an end with the sight."

"When he said this Suvaskumāra said to him: "This dream indicates success preceded by struggle. The stream of water is battle, it is due to valour that you did not sink, but danced, and were carried along by the water; the wind, that turned back the water for you, is some saviour to whom men resort for protection, and the man of fiery brightness, who drew you out of it, is Siva in bodily form. And that he threw you into the fire means that you are cast into a great war, and that cloud arose, that means the returning again of fear, and the rain of a stream of blood, that means the destroying of fear, and the filling of all the quarters with blood, that means great success for you."

This passage, though differing both in content and in meaning, may remind the readers of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam of Brahma's story and of Sarasvati's interpretation. Both these incidents foretell the future and both contain a story and an interpretation. While the former has not much significance and beauty, the latter has.

Apart from these influences there are certain supernatural phenomena in the stories of the Kathāśaritsāgara and these seem to have been exploited to the greatest extent possible in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. For example there is more than one story in the former, wherein a *Vidyādhara* maiden changes her form into that of the wife of the hero whom she happens to love and manages to marry him in the end. This strange principle is met with in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam when Kalabhāsini assumes the form of Rambha, gets united with Maṇikandhara who in his turn assumes the form of Nalakūbara and marries him in the end though in the next birth. But there is this fundamental difference to be noted. Both the heroine and the hero assume altogether different forms from their own and get united. Such an interesting situation as this is not to be found anywhere in the whole of the Kathasaritsagara. Only a mention of a similar situation is to be found in Jayadeva's Gitagovinda and Kadirīpari's Śukasaptati.

The second principle is that a man or woman who falls or happens to fall into a river, lake or sea gets swallowed by a fish or crocodile, and reaches the shore alive and later on meets his or her relative. This principle is exploited by Sūrana more than once when Sugātri is devoured by a cocodile and later on disgorged by it on the shore of the Satatāladaghna. The same is the case with Yajnasarman's wives who leap into the sea. They are first drawn into the stomach of a big whale along with water and then exaled with such a force that they fall alive on an aeroplane passing by. As a matter of fact, the whole episode of Yajnasarman - his passion for charity, his separation from his wives, their conception and giving birth to four chidren who later on become *purōhitas* and their reconciliation with their father - appears for all practical purposes to have been borrowed *in toto* from the Kathāsaritsāgara. The atomosphere, the incidents, the characters and the technique are sure to strengthen this opinion. But this episode is completely an independent and original creation of Sūrana. Such is his creative faculty that, if this is inserted into the kathasaritsagara, no one, however great an expert he may be, can probably detect the interpolation.

The third principle is the propitiation of God, or Goddess, or a demi-God with terrible adventure, or homicide, or suicide, achieving thereby supernatural powers or desired objects. In many a story in the Kathāsaritsāgara the hero ultimately falls back on this device and achieves his object. One finds a similar characteristic in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam also when Maṇistambha, Sumukhāsatti, Kalabhāṣiṇi, Maṇikandhara, Alaghuvrata, Salyāsura and Abhinavakaumudi attain their respective ends in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana. Maṇistambha acquires the two supernatural powers of *dūradṛṣṭi* and *dūraśravana - 'sakti* by his terrible sacrifice. Sumukhāsatti regains her lost youth in addition to that power by which her very word becomes true. Maṇikandhara becomes an emperor by sacrificing Kalabhāṣiṇi. The rest also achieve their objects described in the previous chapter. But even here Sūrana's daring originality astounds the reader. None of the stories in the Kathasaritsagara contains the incident where a character attains any one of the supernatural powers of *dūraśravana, dūradṛṣti* and *avitathavāk*.

The fourth principle is the extensive use of curses and boons of Gods, demi-Gods or seers and the spreading of the story over more than one life. The story of Sumanas which is already mentioned as a regular source of the Kādambari, is a concrete example. How this principle is utiised in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam need not be explained here, as it has been already dealt with at length in connection with the question of Bana's work as a source. Apart from these similarities, there are other reasons to believe that kathāsaritsāgara might have influenced Sūrana. The former work in delineating the story generally, adopts the flash-back technique and often weaves a story within a story. It deliberately avoids elaborate and tedious descriptions, brings in strange but interesting incidents and gains tempo by rapid narration. Generally speaking, these stories and episodes belong to the realm of adventure - adventure on land and sea, earth and heaven. Not only this earth, but the worlds above, and the worlds below are also brought into the picture. Various types of love, adventure, disappointment, and wonder attract the reader and carry him to the highest pitch of imagination. The same is true of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. As already pointed out, Sūrana adopts this flash - back technique and weaves a story within a story to a moderate extent when he begins the poem with the introduction of Kalabhāsini, Nārada, Maṇikandhara, Rambha and Nalakūbara instead of a description of the love episode of Sarasvathi and Caturmukha. When the story continues, the poet makes Maṇistambha narrate the wonderful episode of Rambha and Nalakūbara and their conflict with their respective rivals. While Maṇikandhara narrates the story of Sālīna and Sugātri, the baby in the cradle tells the stories of Sarasvati and Caturmukha, the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, the episode of Abhinavakaumudi and the tale of Yajñasarman and his wives. Madhuralālasa reveals the past history of Satvādātman. How the story gains momentum at each step need not be discussed here. That the very temple of Mrgendravahana is the abode of adventure and surprise is well known to the readers of the story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Maṇistambha, Manikandhara, Salyasura, Sugātri, Kalabhāṣiṇi, the wives of Yajñasarman, and Satvadātman with their deeds of

adventure and sacrifice carry the readers really to the land of horror and wonder. They are presented not with a single incident taking place in a simple country, but with a multitude of events happening in different worlds, one in Brahmalōka, another in Svarga and yet another on the earth. Added to these, there is a vivid picture of various types of love. The love between Nalakūbara and Rambha, between Maṇikandhara and Kalabhāṣiṇi, Kalabhāṣiṇi's approach to Nalakūbara, Salyāsurā's craving for Abhinavakaumudi, the love between Sugātri and Salīna, between Sarasvati and Caturmukha, between Madhuralālasa and Kalāpūrṇa, the lustful longings of Maṇistambha for Kalabhāṣiṇi and the aspirations of Satvadātman for Sumukhāsatti are really astonishing alike in the their range of erotic experience and insight into the working of the human heart.

So far everything appears in order. Sūrana may be said to have been influenced by the Kathāsaritsāgara. But what is the positive proof to say that the poet has ever read this book? At the very begining of the poem he praises the authors of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata of Sanskrit and Telugu versions. In the *avatārika* he mentions only fourteen *purāṇās* by their names and includes the remaining four in the word, *adi* As he has already been pointed out, Sūrana generally acknowledges his indebtedness at least by way of suggestion. He has nowhere directly or indirectly mentioned either Kathāsaritsāgara or its author Sōmādēva. Hence, this question demands an answer. Is there any room for such a conjecture as putforth here?

What is meant here is that Sūrana might have read the Kathāsaritsāgara. That it is highly probable can be supported by various reasons because Bṛhatkatha was translated by Sōmadēva as early as the 11th century. Moreover, there are concrete grounds for assuming that the same Sanskrit text or probably the original was known to Telugu scholars of the 12th century. Fragments of the Telugu version of the Vētālapañcavimśati, which forms a part of the Kathāsaritsāgara and which is said to be written by the Teluga poets of the 12th century, are available. Added to this, there is ample evidence of its being read by the poets of the 16th

century. Though not mentioned, Kandukūri Rudrayya used the story of the Bold Gambler Thinthakarāla to be found in the Kathāsaritsāgara[52] as a regular source and wrote his poem, the Nirankusōpākhyānam Apart from these circumstantial evidences, Sūrana is well acquainted with the Alankarika treatises of the Kāshmiri writers. This point, as it is going to be discussed elaborately in some other chapter, need not be stressed here. Given that Sūrana had gone through these works, there is no ground for believing that he had missed particularly this important book. Hence it can be safely asserted that there is no positive proof to show that he was not acquainted with the Kathāsaritsāgara. On the other hand, as shown above, there is greater scope for putting forth the theory which is here advocated.

Before closing the question of sources, another point needs discussion. Some critics have maintained that the Āscaryacūdāmaṇi of Saktibhadra is one of the sources of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. This is not an altogether baseless assertion provided all are generally agreed on considering it a source of inspiration rather than a regular source. The story as it is related by Saktibhadra, runs as follows :-

While Rāma was staying at Pañcavati with his brother Laksmana and his wife Sīta, Śūrpaṇakha, Ravana's sister, happened to see them, and fell in love with both the brothers. She assumed the form of a beautiful girl and approached Rama who directed her to Lakṣmaṇa. The latter plainly explained to her his position and vow, but this served no purpose. She again met Rama, and once again he sent her to his brother. When he refused her love, she assumed her real form, and carrying him forcibly on her shoulders, flew into the air with the sole object of gratifying her passion on a mountain. Undaunted by this sudden attack, Lakṣmaṇa managed to cut off her nose and ears and she dropped him to the ground in her terrible agony.

Later on, to wreak vengeance on them, Sūrpaṇakha's brothers Khara and Dūsaṇa, attacked Rama and Lakṣmaṇa and were finally killed. The sages, thus being relieved of their nuisance, sent a magic ring and a crest jewel as presents through Lakṣmaṇa

to his brother and his sister-in-law. These two articles had the peculiar power to enable the wearers by their touch to force persons assuming new forms to appear in their true colours. Enraged by the death of her brothers, Sūrpanakha persuaded her elder brother, Rāvana to take action against Rāma. Rāvaṇa first sent Marīca to draw away Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa from Sīta, and then he proceeded to the cottage in his chariot with his sister. As he came near the cottage, he and his chariot driver assumed the forms of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. They approached Sīta when she was alone and informed her that their presence was required at Ayōdhya, for their brother Bharata was threatened with an invasion by their enemies. Credulous woman that she was, Sīta believed them and their words and got into the chariot only to be carried away. On their way, Rāvaṇa who had fallen in love with Sīta, touched her hair with the result that his assumed form dissolved into his natural one. Though she was able to understand the deceit and the real situation in which she was involved, she could not help being carried away to Lanka.

Rāma also was prevented from coming to her receue, for Sūrpanakha, assuming the form of Sīta, met him on the way while he was returning. He was not able to detect the fraud and carried on a conversation with her as if she were Sīta When he saw tears in her eyes, he wanted to console her. Naturally he wiped them with his ringed finger. To his great surprise and disgust, her assumed form immediately disappeared thus revealing her true nature. Lakṣmaṇa, losing his temper at her treachery, wanted to kill her on the spot ; but his brother dissuaded him from it. Thus she managed to escape from the jaws of death.

The rest of the story runs as it is in the Rāmāyana but with slight changes which do not count much in this context. This episode depicted in the first four acts of the Ascaryacudamani is said to be the source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. No doubt there is some similarity between this and the episode of Māyā Rambha and Māyā Nalakūbara. In both the episodes a man and a woman assume the forms of others that are loved and thus create an interesting situation. In the Ascaryacūdāmaṇi, this is brought about by the inherent power of Rākṣasās whereas in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam it is due to a boon in the case of Kalabhāṣiṇi

and to the power of penance in the case of Maṇikandhara. But this similarity fades into insignificance when differences are taken into consideration. Sūrpanakha in the form of Sīta meets Rāma and achieves her real object of preventing him from saving his wife. But it is quite different with Kalabhāṣiṇi who assumes the form of Rambha and gets united only with Maṇikandhara who happens to be in the form of Nalakūbara. It is true that she has love for Maṇikandhara but her immediate object is the union with Nalakūbara but not with the former. Whereas Rāvana under the guise of Rāma carries away Sita and achieves his object, Maṇikandhara partly succeeds and partly fails in his object, for, firstly, he meets the real Rambha and later on the Māyā Rambha. Besides these, there are other differences in character and situation which make the episode in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam all the more subtle and intricate. Technically speaking, the principal *rasa* in the episode of Ascaryacūdamani is *adbhuta* having *karuna* as its accessary. In the episode of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam the principal rasa is *hāsya* attended by *adbhuta* and *sṛngāra*. Of course it cannot be denied that there is a tinge of *karuna* There are also *hāsya* and *vīra* present. The driving force in the first is revenge whereas in the second it is love and nothing else. that is why one cannot regard it as a regular source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Even granting that the former is a source, it is so only so far as Māyā Rambha and Māyā Nalakūbara are concerned and not of the whole poem. At best it can be considered as one of the many influences that acted upon Sūrana in relation to the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Even to this conjecture, objections may be raised and positive proofs demanded. But these do not and cannot have any weight because Sūrana himself seems to recognise it by way of suggestion when he makes Kalabhāṣiṇi say :-

సీ. అట్లైనఁ బ్రాణనాయక నినుఁ గౌఁగిటఁ
బాయ నే వెఱతు నీమాయలాడి
యారూపుతో మన కెడసేయ నేతెంచె
నదియొ తొల్లియు నొక్క యసురజంత
జనకనందనకు రామునకును నెడసేయఁ
గడఁగి వచ్చుట వినఁబడుచు నుండ [53]

This incident mentioned in the underlined lines obviously refers to the mischief played by Sūrpanakha. This is admitted by Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyaṇa Sāstri[54] in his commentary. This incident is not to be found either in the Vālmiki Rāmāyana or other Rāmāyaṇās in Telugu.[55] It is obvious from Vālmiki's work that Sūrpanakha has craved only for the love of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. There is not even a single hint to be had about her direct participation in the plot to bring about the separation of Rāma and Sīta. If that is so, to what incident do these lines refer ?

Let the problem be approached from another angle also. Assuming, for the time being, that there is such an incident in Vālmilki Rāmāyaṇa, what purpose does it serve when the poet uses the two words *vinabaducunundu* ? Has he used them only to complete the line ? No one who is acquainted with Sūrana's mode of expression can admit it. so the reference to some other work than that of Valmiki in which Sūrpanakha is portrayed as having played this specific role seems inevitable. Then it must be either Saktibhadra's Āscaryacūdāmani or some other work depicting Rāvaṇa and Sūrpanakha assuming the forms of others. There are other grounds for suggesting this interpretation. If one takes the above lines as alluding to the incident in the Rāmāyaṇa, he will be tempted to say that the poet has not read it at all. Morover, the poet will be considered not only ignorant of the law of association but also quite incompetent in handling the language and the metre. On the other hand, if the above lines are taken to refer to the incident in the third act of Āscaryacūdāmaṇi, or to that similarly treated in another work, they will tend to enhance the beauty of the poem to a greater extent. The incident referred to will anticipate the episode of Māyā Nalakūbara. Of course the poet has already suggested it in the first canto itself,[56] but by the time the reader reaches the 188th verse in the third canto, there is every likelihood of his forgetting the first suggestion. By this prompt allusion the readers' anticipation and curiosity gain more in intensity. Every word and letter, then, becomes all the more significant. The poet also can be said to acknowledge his indebtedness to his predecessor.

And now, as all the so-called sources have been examined, what is the conclusion ? Is the theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam orginal, or borrowed ? There is no dearth of evidence to show that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is the product of the poet's own imagination. The so-called sources can be interpreted in different ways but it can be maintained that they cannot be called regular sources.

At the most, some of them may be considered as having influenced the poet in the construction of one of the world's best stories ; and those influences of which he is consciously aware have been duly acknowledged by him by way of suggestion. If doubt still persists as to its originality, the following points may be considered :

> అత్యపూర్వకథా సంవిధాన వైచిత్రీ మహనీయంబును శృంగారరస ప్రాయంబును బుణ్యవస్తువర్ణ నాకర్ణనీయంబును నగు కళాపూర్ణోదయం బను మహా కావ్యంబు నిర్మింపఁ గడంగితి. [57]

Requested by Kalabhāsiṇi Ṇārada tells her :-

> ఆ రంభ ప్రియునకుఁ జెప్పరా దనిన కథ యత్యపూర్వంబు నాకునుం జెప్పఁ దగదు .... [58]

Nor only Sūrana used the word apūrva but, also makes his readers understand that the episode dealing with Sugātri and Sālina was described by Sarasvati and handed over to the citizens of Saradāpiṭha. If it was not orginal, and if he did not feel it to be very beautiful, he would not have attributed it so Sarasvati.59 Moreover, if he had any particular source for his Kalāpūrṇōdayam, he would have certainly mentioned it as he had done in the Prabhāvatipradyumnam. Such mention is not found anywhere in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.

Secondly, tradition mentions Rāmakrishna as having uttered this line :-

> " ఊహించి తెలియరాకుండ సూరపరాజు
> శ్రమఁ గళాపూర్ణోదయము రచించె." [60]

Though it attributes unintelligibility to the poem, it definitely admits it to be an original work.

Thirdly, the Kalāpūrṇōdayam presupposes the Rāghavapāndavīyam, and therefore it could not have been written by any other person than Sūrana. This statement certainly requires elaboration. What is meant by it is that the technique adopted in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is simply that of the Rāghavapāndavīyam, but it has gained more in subtlety, depth and aesthetic insight. Had he not written the Rāghavapāndavīyam, he could never have produced the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. This clearly implies that it could not have been written by any other poet than Surana and it is *sui generis*.

In writing the Rāghavapāndavīyam, the poet himself says[61] that he has adopted the following devices : firstly, use of such words which when taken as those of Sanskrit origin give one meaning, and when taken as of Telugu origin give a different meaning; secondly, adoption of the peculiar structure of words which can be split up in more than one way so as to give different meanings; thirdly, exploitation of the secondary meanings of words; fourthly, creating situations which bestow different senses upon the words; fifthly, exploitation of the *anvaya* of words which gives more than one meaning; sixthly and lastly, exploitation of all or some of the above devices in combination.

These same devices are followed in the construction of the story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Every reader of the poem poem will admit that without the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha there can be no Kalāpūrṇōdayam. The full growth and development of this particular episode has resulted in the poem[62], and if this is removed, it will become only a bunch of incidents without much significance. And this episode which is the soul of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam cannot be conceived by any other creative genius than one well-versed in the technique described above. Just as the poet in his Raghavapandaviyam brought together the stories of the Rāmāyana and the Bhārata in one poem, so also he has brought together the dalliance of Sarasvati and Caturmukha and the seeds of the plot of the whole poem in one episode. Of course there is a fundamental difference : the former remains as a *dvyarthi kāvya* while the latter becomes the best *dhvani kāvya.*

The second concrete example of this technique is Nāradā's boon without which the Kalāpūrṇōdayam could not have come into existence. This boon bestowed upon Kalabhāsini[63] carries two meanings, one that she would be united with Nalakūbara and the other that she would be united with one having the form of Nalakubara.

The third instance is that of Prathamagama and others getting into the service of Madāśaya[64]. Of course this is not so important as the boon of Nārada, but without it the story will certainly be defective. The technique used here is of the first type which reveals the remarkable command of the poet of the two languages, Sanskrit and Telugu.

And finally, the fifth device mentioned above is amply exploited on many an occasion in the poem. The story of Sugātri and Sālīna, narrated by Maṇikandhara appears for the first time only as an illustration of a certain tendency in a character but later on becomes an integral part of the story. The charges and counter charges, abuses and counter abuses exchanged between Nalakūbara and Māyā Nalakūbara on the one hand, and between Rambha and Māyā Rambha on the other hand, and that too in the presence of Rambha or Māyā Nalakūbara or Nārada, pulsate with more than two meanings. Really this is an unprecedented situation not only in Telugu literature but also in the whole realm of Sanskirt.

Apart from its unexampled technical excellence, there is another important factor which makes one think that the poem is original through and through. The aim and outlook of the poet, as it will be explained in a subsequent chapter, is unique. He wants to depict the relation between life and art, to propound his theory of beauty. Just as Ibsen and other modern writers have taken social, cultural, political and psychological problems for their themes, so also Sūrana took aesthetic problems as the regular theme of his poem. Because his problems and the solutions he gives are not mere echoes of previous history (of literature and philosophy), but are his own, his poem is original and unique. This appears to be generally ignored by many critics perhaps due

to their conscious or unconscious belief that knowledge is absolute and changeless, that there can be nothing new that is not mentioned in Vedās, and that even Brahma, the Lord of of the universe, cannot create anything new which is not in accord with that of the previous *kalpa*. If this is not so, it is diffcult to follow critics who say that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is as original as Kalidāsā's Śākuntala[65]. Anyone who has read either the Padmapurāṇa or the Mahābhārata can give at least a rough sketch of the Abhijnāna Śākuntala. But can anyone who has not read the Kalāpūrṇōdayam give even an outline of its theme after going through its so called sources? Certainly one cannot; yet it is amazing that, these are being confidently asserted as its sources.

Now to summarise the result : None of the *purāṇās* or *kāvyās* in Sanskrit or Telugu seems to have any claim to be regarded as a regular source. The episode of Nārada in the Lingapurāṇa, the incidents in the third and the fourth Acts of the Āścarya chūdamaṇi, and the story at the very beginning of Kathāsaritsāgara may be considered as influences. But even to give a complete account of even these influences is practically an impossible task. The reasons are many. The first is that the history of 16th century in its true sense is yet to be written. Secondly, leaving alone the biography, the actual dates of the poet and the complete list of his writings are not available. Even if his complete biography is obtainable, all the influences cannot be exhausted, becuse even the latest discoveries in psychology leave a large part of the human mind yet unrevealed. Even Sūrana, were he to come back to life, might not be able to tell us all the things that influenced him. So what may be reasonably said in this connection is that he might have been influenced more by the Kathāsaritsāgara than by the *purāṇas* Even Mr. Umakantam, who was well known for his puritanical outlook, admitted the originality of the poem[66]. So this question may be closed with the following epitaph:-

"The structure of the story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is unique. We have not read or heard of another of its kind existing. Such a beautiful construction is so far neither probably seen nor heard of in any country, or in any part of a literary work."[67]

CHAPTER IV

THE THREE ALLEGORIES AND THEIR REFUTATION

This great story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam, manifesting world after world to our unfailing amazement, has set the critics a-thinking. As a matter of fact, the title of the poem itself at first sight is suggestive of a vast world because the compound word of Kalāpūrṇa may mean the moon, or that which is complete with parts, or that which is full of art, or the phenomena or the embodied soul. The various characters in the poem such as Satvadātman, Maṇistambha, Sumukhāsatti, Svabhāva, Madasaya, Rupanubhuti, Madhuralalasa, Alaghuvrata and Abhinavakaumudi, places and countries like the temple of Mrgendravahana, Kasarapura, Angadesa and Kramukakanṭhottarapura, the episodes like that of Sarasvati and Caturmukha, the pursuit of Salyasura after Abhinavakaumudi are also very alluring.

Tempted by these words, one critic advanced the theory that the kalāpūrṇōdayam contains not one but three separate allegories. According to him this poem of Sūrana contains the philosophical, the erotic and the historical allegories. To substantiate the first, this critic draws attention to three separate passages in the Praśnōpaniṣad with Sankarā's commentary thereon. The first passage which forms the first Mantra of the Sixth Question, when freely translated reads :-

> " Next, Sukēśa of the clan of Bharadvāja asked him: ' Venerable Sir, Hiraṇyanābha the prince of Kōsala, came to me and asked me this question, " Well, Bharadvāja, do you know the *purusa* who is of sixteen *kalas* (parts) ?" I replied to the prince, ' I do not know him, if I do, why should I not tell it to thee ? He who tells a lie, perishes root and all;so it behoves me not to tell a lie.' He

got silently into his chariot and went away.
So I ask thee where is that *purusa* ?" (What
is that *purusa*, according to Sankara.)

Here *sōḍaśakalāh purusa* or *puruṣa* having sixteen parts means, according to Sankara, the puruṣa on whom the sixteen parts or *kalas* are superimposed by Avidya.[69] This term is explained by Ramanuja, the founder of Visistādvaita, in another way. (This is not referred to by this learned critic). According to this interpretation it means Jīva or embodied soul coming into possession of sixteen *kalas* or parts beginning with *prāṇa* and ending with name or *nàman* Whatever may be the interpretation, in his opinion Kalāpūrṇa means Jīvātman. So this poem Kalāpūrṇōdayam contains, this critic *argues*, a philosophical allegory. As further evidence, he refers to *phalaśṛuti* in this poem playing an improtant role. It says that those who tell the tales of Kalāpūrṇa and those who hear them alike would be born as mortals on the earth and live for a long time, enjoying a long succession of children, grand-children, great grand-children and so on, and also wealth and happiness of all kinds.[70] This is simply echoing the eleventh Mantra of the Third Question in the Praśnōpanisad which says :- " The progeny of the wise man who knows the *prāna* as such never perishes, he becomes immortal."[71] Sankara commenting on this says :-

యఃకశ్చి దేవం విద్వాన్ యథోక్తవి శేషణైర్విశిష్ట ముత్పత్త్యాదిభిః
ప్రాణం వేద జానాతి తస్యేదం ఫల మైహికాముష్మికం చోచ్యతే.
నహా అస్య నైవాస్య విదుషః ప్రజాపుత్ర పౌత్రాది లక్షణా
హీయతే ఛిద్యతే పతితే చ శరీరే ప్రాణ సాయుజ్యతయా
అమృతః అమృతత్వధర్మా భవతి. తత్ ఏతస్మిన్నర్థే సంక్షేపాభి
ధాయక ఏషశ్లోకః మంత్రో భవతి. [72]

Therefore, the cirtic maintains, the poem must necessarily have an allegory. Before proceeding to elucidate it, he explains what these sixteen *kalas* are. They are, he says, Vision, Hearing, Smell, Taste, Touch, Speech, Handling, Sex impulse, Excretion, Walking, Mind, Buddhi (intelligence), Ahamkāra (individuality ?), Chittam (consciousness), Tējas (understanding) and *prāṇa*.[73] But

the Mantra which he quotes, includes the five elements also [74] One is at a loss to understand why he omitted the five elements. If he includes them, the number becomes twenty-one and not sixteen. In that case he should have relied upon the fourth Mantra of the Sixth Question which exactly gives the names of these sixteen *kalas* as *prāna,* Faith, Ether, Air, Fire, Water, Earth, the Senses, the Mind, Food, Vigour, Penance, the Vedās, the Yājnas, the worlds and Name or Nāman.[75] On the contrary he says that there is a slight difference between lists provided by the eighth Mantra of the Fourth Question and the fourth Mantra of the Sixth Question. The contents of the first list are nothing but an elaborate description of the contents of the second. This much can be understood even by the laity. In that case, one has to explain why the critic has deviated from this obvious course. If he admits that Prana etc. are the sixteen *kalas,* he will have not only to say that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam contains an allegory dealing with the complete emergence of the whole universe, but also to substantiate his statement from the contents of the poem. To avoid such an apparently impossible task he seems to have taken the other course. Even granting that his own list of sixteen *kalas,* i.e., Vision etc. is valid, is he able to explain this philosophical allegory he reads into the poem ? It is interesting to see how he substantiates his theory.

" Angadēsa is the human body. In this Angadēsa, the town of Kasarapuram is the metropolis. Kasarapuram stands for the heart which is the lake or source of supply for the whole body (Hrdaya Kasaram). In the town of Kasarapuram, King Satwadātman was, after a period of anarchy, the first ruling sovereign. That is to say, in the human heart, Intelligence or Buddhi, after a period of comparative ignorance, first reveals itself and assumes control of the human body. King Satwadātman, conscious of the superior virtues of Kalāpurna, abdicated the throne in his favour and became his prime minister. In other words, intelligence gradually gives place to the superior power of the soul (Jīvātma). Kalāpūrna is thus the human soul (Jīvātma or puruṣha)."

" This Kalāpūrṇa was the offspring of a Brahmana couple Maṇiṣtambha and Sumukhāsatti. Maṇisthambha and Sumukhāsatti are the Ìswara and Māya, and Kalāpūrṇa or the human soul is the manifestation of this union. Maṇisthambha, the husband, assumed at the time of union the form of the wife Sumukhāsatti, and the wife that of the husband. This only signifies Īswara, the Lord of the universe, pleases himself by coming under the influence of Māya or prakriti and yet retaining his own individuality. Sumukhāsatti was the daughter of Swabhāva, or in other words, Māya or prakriti is self-born. Swabhāva gave Kalāpūrṇa a bow and arrows. The bow is the mind and the arrows are the senses and by means of the mind and the five senses, Kalāpūrṇa or Jīvātma could bring into his possession, Madāśaya or the material universe, and Rūpānubhūti its capacity to please. Madāśaya, the material universe and Rūpānubhūti, its enjoyment were the parents of madhuralālasa or the desire for pleasure and King Kalāpūrṇa's marriage of Madhuralālasa means that the Jīvātma enjoys the pleasures of the senses. Before this marriage, King Kalāpūrṇa wedded the princess, Abhinavakaumudi, an apsarasa of the moon. Abhinavakaumudi means moonlight or Chitsakti and just as moonlight is inseparable from the Moon, so also this chitsakti is inseparable from Jīvātma. This double meaning was brought about by the Ślēṣha in the word Kalāpūrṇa meaning the Moon or the Soul. Abhinavakaumudi means fresh moonlight and is an inseparable power of the Moon. So also, Abhinavakaumudi as Chitsakti is an inseparable power of Jīvātma. King Kalāpūrṇa begot on Abhinavakaumudi a son named Suprasāda and on Madhuralālasa a son named Sarasa. In other words the human soul by Chitsakti acquires prasannatvam (benignity) and by the desire for pleasure attains Rasikatwam (artistic culture). King Kalāpūrṇa waged war against King Madāśaya and in the end married the latter's daughter Madhuralālasa. On the other hand, he rescued the princess Abhinavakaumudi from the fury of Salyāsura and wedded her. This shows that the human soul while fighting against the lower pleasures of the senses (Madāśaya and Rūpānubhūti) keeps itself free to enjoy the higher

pleasures of the world (Madhuralālasa) and at the same time overcomes obstacles to live in the pure enjoyment of the divine glory (Abhinavakaumudi)."[76]

If the foregoing explanation is really the thing which the poet intended to impart to his readers, probably one will have but little respect for the author as a poet and philosopher. What are the relations between the body, the intelligence (mind) and the soul ? All the six systems of Indian Philosophy maintain that the body comes into the world along with Jīvātman, that it exists only for its sake, and that it decays with its departure. The Kalāpūrṇōdayam clearly makes its readers understand that Angadēsa had existed even before Satvadātman became its king, and that it was older than Kalāpūrṇa. It futher informs us that Satvadātman makes love to Sumukhāsatti who, according to this critic, is nothing but Māya or the cosmic illusion. Another thing to be noted in this connection is that the term Satvadātman literally means the good soul of yours. How do these facts fit into the allegory the critic reads into the poem ?

If Maṇistambha and Sumukhāsatti are, as this critic asserts, Īsvara and Māya, Īsvara will not be the agent who begets this universe and the embodied souls through his union with Māya as Indian philosophy maintains ; but Māya herself will be the agent. Otherwise, how is one to interpret the episode of Maṇistambha and his wife mutually exchanging their sexes ? Why has the poet mentioned this couple as the citizens of Kashmir, depicted their love episodes and narrated Svabhāva's strange history? What purpose does it serve when the poet makes the *yōgin* abnegate his property, leave his wife and daughter behind and hide himself in the lake of the Satatāladaghna in the name of penance? How does Svabhāva's bestowing a bow and nine arrows on Kalāpūrṇa symbolise the mind and the body (the city of nine gates)?[77] The words *nava-saramulu* cannot indicate or symbolise the nine gates by any stretch of imagination. The critic maintains that Madāśaya stands for material universe, while, Rūpānubhūti signifies its capacity to please. Had the poet really this view in mind, he would have used the word Rūpānubhāvyata instead of Rūpānubhūti.

Another incongruity that is to be reckoned with in this context is the nature of 'Chitsakti'. How can she become a victim to the fury of Asuras and be saved by Jīvātman? Strange it may appear to be, but all the same it is the logical corollary of this allegory. Let the episode of Abhinavakaumudi speak for itself. She who stands for "Chitsakti" was loved and pursued by Salyasura and later on saved by Kalāpūrṇa. How is it possible for Salyāsura to fall in love with "Chitsakti"? It must be that he was not an Asura, or she was not really "Chitsakti."

Besides the points mentioned above, he advances another theory. Hitherto it is taught by Indian philosophers that on realisation of "Chitsakti" one does not fall a prey to mundane pleasures. But the critic simply sublates this theory when he explains that Kalāpūrṇa, the Jīvātman, married Abhinavakaumudi, the "Chitsakti" and Madhuralālasa, "the higher pleasure of the world" and that he lived with both of them and begot Suprasāda, 'benignity', and Sarasa, 'the artistic culture.'

With the foregoing analysis in view, one has to come to one of the following conclusions - either that Sūrana had relied upon Praśnōpaniṣad as a source, that he could not understand what the sixteen *kalas* were even though he had the commentaries of Sankara and Rāmānuja on hand, and that he made a mess of the elementary principles and utterly failed to depict the allegory, or, one has to understnad that Praśnōpanisad was never the source of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and that the poet had never intended his poem to be an allegory. Any one who has read the poem will probably prefer the second to the first. This view will be strengthened all the more on a closer examination of the love episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha.

The same critic maintains that this episode also contains an erotic allegory; and as an explanation, he repeats Sarasvati's commentary on the story narrated by Brahma to the parrot.[78] After going through this explanation the reader will be at a loss to know what the allegory is. Every reader knows before reading Sarasvati's commentary thereon that the story is nothing but the sublimation of Brahma's love for her. Sarasvati's commentary

will only confirm the reader's anticipation and enhance his aesthetic pleasure. But where is the secondary meaning in the story? What is an allegory if it has not an independent secondary meaning throughout or at least in a part of the narration? It is well known that *dhvani* or suggestion is worlds apart from allegory. Because an allegorical poem contains more than one important and independent meaning, it appears for all practical purposes to be somewhat nearer to the sustained *prakrtaprakrta slesa* of the Indian Ālamkārikās, but on no account can these two be considered as identical or parallel to each other. And *dhvani* or suggestion, as Ānandavardhana defines[79] it, is that in which either the word or the meaning or both subordinating themselves manifest the particular kind of poem. The word manifesting beauty which cannot be expressed in any other way and possessing suggestivity is *dhvani.* When the various kinds of beauties of the words and meanings, i.e., words, meanings, figures of speech and *gunās* have *rasās,* etc., as their sole aim, it is *dhvani.* The story narrated by Brahma in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam expresses simply his love for Sarasvati and nothing else. It does not propound allegorically any theory of love or philosophy of love. The lake, the moonlight, the reflected face of Sarasvati in Manistambha, the actions and reactions and their feelings are *vibhāvās, anubhvāas* and *vyabhicāris.* By their combination *rati* is being manifiested. Thus the story is only one of *śrṅgara rasa dhvani* and not an allegory.

The most important thing to be noted in this connection is Sarasvati's commentary on the story narrated by Brahma, the Lord of Creation. The suggested meaning is explained clearly in the cut and dry way of the day to day life.[80] According to this explanation the lake is spoken of as Kasarapura and the reflected face of Sarasvati as the King Kalāpūrṇa. Kalāpūrṇa conquering the other kings means that the reflected face of Sarasvati is far superior to all other faces in beauty. Kalapurna getting a bow. arrows and a jewel from Svabhava should be uderstood in the sense that the face was endowed with beautiful eye-brows, looks and lips by nature. While Madāśaya stands for the wish of Brahma,

Rupānubhūti represents the enjoyment of formal beauty. The delicate smile of Sarasvati is spoken of as Abhinavakaumudi whereas the beautiful proximity and the jewelled pillar are symbolised as Sumukhāsatti, the father and as Maṇistambha, the mother. Kramukakanthottarapura is nothing but the upper part of the body above the neck. Satvadātman, Prathamāgama and others stand for Sarasvati and the four faces of Brahma. Brahma's desire to kiss the lips is signified by Madhuralālasa.

If the poet, as this critic explains, had intended both the allegories, why did he commit himself to one definite meaning in Sarasvati's commentary? Would it not have served him better if he had omitted it? He did not leave the matter there. On the other hand the poet suggests through the character of Sarasvati[81] :- "Ah! serving you (the Lord of Creation) as I do, don't I know this much, my lord? These skilful words and these ideas are after all my arts, and I have bestowed them on you." This clearly means:- "After working so long in the field of literature, I know what is what. I am the creator and bestow my words and ideas on you. Take them only in the sense I mean." The poet seems to be very particular on this point. As soon as Sarasvati's commentary is over, he again makes her get the approval of Brahma, the all-pervading soul of cosmos. He crisply says:- "That is exactly so, and it cannot fail."[82] Not satisfied with this too, the poet censures critics reading their own thoughts into his poem by way of suggestion when he makes

Sarasvati say:-

క తలపెట్టకుఁ డిట వెన్నుఁడుఁ
గలవైనను మత్ప్రసంగ కారణమున వ
క్రిసిసక్తి యూహ పేక్షితి
యుఁడ సక్తిపి గోరఁ దివియ నేత్రై పాలున్. [83]

When the poet openly suggests time and again that what he says is true, what right has a *sahṛdaya* to contradict him?

The third is the historical allegory[84] which this critic reads into the poem. He is not sure which historical person is meant by Kalāpūrṇa and openly admits it when he says :- "Who this per-

sonage is cannot at present be exactly stated, first, because of the scanty material in the story, and secondly, because of the meagre knowledge we still possess of the history of the royal dynasties of South India and I have only striven hereunder to give the most approximate interpretation of the allegory which, I think, certainly exists in the poem."[85]

In spite of this uncertainty he deliberately continues his pursuit and tries to explain that Kasarapura stands for Vijayanagaram.[86] But this analogy seems to be a mistake because Kasarapura did not get its name because of its proximity to the lake, but the lake itself was spoken of as a city. The poet through Sarasvati says:-

గీ. కొలఁకు కాసారపురముగాఁ బలికి యందుఁ
బొలుచు నామోమునీడ సంపూర్ణశశియు
నను తలంపునఁ బలికితి రవుడు దానిఁ
బ్రకటముగఁ గళాపూర్ణుఁడన్ రాజు గాఁగ [87]

And again he describes the words of Sumukhāsatti who was no other person than Maṇistambha:-

క. ఈ రమ్య పరిఖనడుమన్
సారపుశృంగములతోడ సాలము పద్మా
కారత నొప్పఁగ నిది కా
సారపురం బండ్రు కొలనిచాడ్పున నునికిన్. [88]

The word చాడ్పు means 'like' but not proximity. The critic, indulging further his imagination, says that Kramukakanthottarapuram signifies Nagalāpuram and gives this explanation:- Krishṇadēvaraya built a town called Nagalāpuram and made it his capital to all intents and purposes. Thus he may be said to have shifted his capital from Kasarapuram (Vijayanagaram) to Kramukakanthottarapuram (Nagalāpuram) for just as in the former name the word 'puram' is after the word 'kantha' so, in the latter word, the word 'puram' is after the word 'gala' and both 'kantha' and 'gala' mean the same thing.[89] This is purely a solecism, an ignoratio *elenchi*.

Then coming to the historical facts, there is definite information that Kṛishṇa Rāya had four wives and not two. Besides this, there is neither tradition nor historical evidence to the effect that he was born of Brahminee parents. Nor is it said that he had ever invaded North India. While Kṛishṇa Rāya had eight great poets in his court, Kalāpūrṇa had only four. So there is apparently no comparison between the two except that both the emperors were followers of Viśiṣṭādvaita cult. It may be argued that one should not search for every minute detail in an allegory as he does in a straight narration. Even granting this, the question still remains unanswered:- Which characteristics or events of Kalāpūrṇa make one think of Kṛishṇadeva Rāya or Narasa Rāya? If one must take into consideration only the realistic human elements by detaching them from the supernatural, how can it be said that the poet only meant Kṛishṇa Rāya or Narasa Rāya? Hence one is forced to agree completely with the Maharāja Sāheb of Pithāpuram when he says: "........... I entirely differ from my friend regarding his theories of allegories, philosophical and historical, in 'Kalāpūrṇōdayam.' I am in very good company, as many eminent scholars of great erudition in Sanskrit and Telugu are in agreement with me." Kavisārvabhauma Sripāda Kṛishṇamūrti Sāstri, the present poet laureate, also is of the same opinion.[90]

Before closing this question of allegories, one has to define what it is, and show how it is an altogether foreign concept to both Sanskrit and Telugu literatures. "An allegory is a trope in which a second meaning is to be read beneath and concurrent with the surface story. Distinguished from metaphor and parable, it is an extended story that may hold interest for the surface tale as well as for the meaning borne along."[91] Thus this second meaning is not subordinate to the surface story, but on the other hand it will be independent of the former. If one traces its origin and historical development, its nature will be all the clearer. To withstand the onslaughts of Rationalism, critics had to defend certain passages and episodes of the great poets and hence began to read a second meaning into them to explain away immorality and apparent incongruity. With this activity there develops

naturally a misconception that literature should be pleasing and at the same time be instructive. Because they were not able to reconcile these mutually opposite concepts,[92] a new literary form came into vogue; and that is allegory. The surface story is meant for pleasure while the latent is intended for instruction. That is why the secondary meaning or story in an allegory will generally be one of ethics or philosophy. This does not mean that there were not historical allegories but they were perhaps of later origin. This mode of reading philosophical import into the works of great writers is not uncommon even with the Pauranikas when they explain *rasa krīda,* Draupadi having five husbands and the like. This is quite unaesthetic and never conceded by the Ālamkārikās. Due to the admixture of two different concepts and their inadequate synchronisation, obscurity has become one of the characteristics of the allegory; and this surface meaning cannot be explained unless the second meaning is taken into consideration. There can be no greater example of this than Spenser's Faerie Queene.

But it is a different story with Sanskrit and Telugu literatures. There were days when the same concept of literature, i.e., that it should be at once pleasing and instructive prevailed in both the fields. Bhatti Kavya and the like in Sanskrit and so many unpoetic passages in the Mahābhārata, Basavapurāṇa, Paṇḍitārādhys Caritra and the like in Telugu are concrete examples of this notion. But the nature and genius of these languages and the profound philosophical insight of the *ālankārikās* helped both these literatures to tread altogether a different path from that of the allegory. These two languages are so finely developed (or so primitive as the moderns like to put it), that even two or tree meanings can be clearly expressed by a single sentence. Exploiting this tendency there came into these literatures *slesa kāvyās, dvyarthi kāvyās* and even *tryārthi* and *caturarthi kāvyās* There might have been even *anulōma* and *vilōma* kāvyās. Here the point is that, though they are grotesque, they are never obscure. Whatever may be the drawbacks of ancient Telugu poets, they can never be charged with obscurity like Spenser, Browning

and others. Thus came into Sanskrit and Telugu literatures *dvyarthi kāvyās* etc. instead of allegorical poems. But this sort of development received a terrible check from one of the world's greatest aesthetician, Ānandavardhana, and he forced them to flow into the profound channels of *dhvani*. In the ninth century itself he clearly defined the soul of poetry as *dhvani* or suggestion, and differentiating it definitely from figures of speech of which *ślēṣa* is one, determined the values of various forms of literary expression. Explaining Anandavardhana's view, Abhinavagupta, the eminent philosopher and perhaps the world's greatest literary critic, pronounced his judgment that *rasa dhvani* or aesthetic experience is the soul of poetry[93] and the poet's primary aim is Ananda[94], or that special pleasure peculiar to fine art.

Thus into both Telugu and Sanskrit literatures there have come *ślēṣa kāvyas, dvyarthi* and *tryarthi kāvyās,* which are somewhat similar to allegorical poems in English and other continental literatures. The common features between the two forms are that both have more than one meaning and these meanings are not only important but also independent. Both these forms have for their ultimate or immediate object expression rather than the aesthetic experience or Ananda. But at the same time, *ślēsa kāvyās* etc. are always plain and without confusion of imagery, while an allegorical poem generally is, though not always, obscure. An allegorical poem carries invariably an ethical or philosophical or historical significance, but the *slesa* and *dvyarthi kāvyās* etc. do not have such a limitation.

Now it may be examined how Dhavani differs from allegory. *Dhvani* should not necessarily have a double meaning whereas an allegory should have more than one. Even where *dhvani* has more than one significance, the expressed one should always be subordinate to, or even annihilate itself in the manifestation of, the suggested; and at the same time it should be beautiful or communicate aesthetic experience. It is not so with allegory. The surface meaning as well as the under-current are important, and also independent. Instruction is not at all the important aim of

dhvani as it is with the latter. While obscurity is an arch enemy of *dhvani*, it is very often an intimate friend of allegory. *Dhvani* exists even in prefixes and suffixes, consonants, vowels and words, in sentences and in the whole work; but allegory cannot exist even in single sententeces.

With these data in view, we may ask what is the place to be assigned to allegory by the *ālankārika* school? Though it differs from ślēṣa and its species, its connections are more with the latter than with *dhvani*. Those who have direct acquaintance with the allegorical poems of Spenser cannot altogether place him in the calss of *Ślēṣa* kavis. Certain portions of the Faerie Queene come under *dhvani*, certain other passages come under *ślēṣa* and its species and the others are worthless.

Now returning to the present topic, can it be maintained that there exists definitely in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam an allegory which is different from *ślēsa* etc. and *dhvani*, and thus altogether foreign to both the tradition of Telugu and Sanskrit?

To summarise (1) Praśnōpaniṣad is never called Kalāpūrṇōpanishad and the sixteen kalas or parts mentioned therein are not simply vision etc. but *prāna* etc. (2) If this Upaniṣad was his source, the poet would have suggested through his poem the emergence of the material universe and the embodied soul. (3) The allegory the critic traces, is fraught with many shortcomings, and he attributes philosophical ignorance, creative impotence, expressional incompetence and gross self-contradiction to the poet. (4) Admission of the existence of allegory means denial of unity in the poem on which the poet set such a high value [95] (5) Above all these considerations, allegory, differing from *dhvani*, *slesa* and its species as pointed above, is altogether a foreign concept. Therefore, it can be positively said that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is not an allegorical poem.

CHAPTER V

SŪRANA AND HIS CRITICS

The theme of the kalāpūrṇōdayam is not only original but also profound. No poem of its length can claim its depth, unity and organic connection. Every incident, character, background and even the names of the personages have much bearing on the whole. It appears as if the poem will not survive even a minor change. That is why it cannot be abridged, as it has been possible with the Kâdambari or with the important works of Tolstoy, without damage to its significance and beauty. Even the title of the poem is as orgnifically and connected with the poem as in the case of Mṛcchakatika. No doubt some writers have published prose versions of it and that too abridged under different titles. But they seem to be caricatures of rather than guides to Sūranā's poem.

To appreciate any work of art certain minimum conditions are to be satisfied. Beauty, after all, is not purely objective. Even simple perceptual knowledge requires object as well as subject. For example the sweetness of sugar depends not only on sugar but also on the perceiving subject. If the person has fever, it will be bitter to him. The same is true of a work of art. To enjoy beauty certain conditions are to be fulfilled by both the work of art and the reader or critic. If either of the two fails, beauty also vanishes. After all what is beauty without its realisation, and what is life without beauty? When such is the meaning, every cultured man will try his level best to improve or adjust himself to every work of art so that he may have as full a vision of its beauty as possible. He keeps aside his personal whims and fancies, likes and dislikes, theories and opinions. and closely follows the artist step by step. If any discrepancy occurs, i.e., if the artist appears grossly to contradict himself, the critic with his cultural equipment adjusts himself and his psychic distance as one does with one's glasses so that all the apparent contradictions disappear. The result may be one of brilliant and profound vision, or a dull

and uninteresting picture. In the whole process the rules and methods followed are strictly those of the artist. So, while the artist has to satisfy the fundamental principles of self-evidentness and self-sufficiency, the critic has to see them as they emerge and pronounce his verdict. If the things delineated are not self-sufficient and self-evident, he has to provide his reasons, and if they are, he has to state clearly how and from what approach and standpoint these can be had. Such a criticism is certainly invaluable on the one hand to the creator, and on the other, to the reader.

But such healthy literary-criticism in Telugu literature is perhaps rather a rarity than a common feature. If the past judged the works of art on the basis of extraneous and dogmatic principles, the present is also probably committing the same mistake by applying a new set of ideologies and idiosyncracies. For example, Potana, the author of Andhra Bhagavata, is not quoted by

the *lākṣaṇikās* simply on the ground that the former has mixed ఠ and ఱ in *prāsa*.[96] Tikkana's Uttara Rāmāyaṇa was not as popular as that of Kankanti Pāpāraju. Religious bias probably weighed heavy against Nannicōda's Kumārasambhavam and Dhūrjati's Sri-kāla-hastimahatmyam. Taking Mammata's statement in the Kāvyaprakāsa[97] as the last word on principles of literary criticism, one critic condemns Śrīnātha for having named his work as Sṛnagāra Naiṣadham. Simply because Mammata condemned the mention of *rasas* etc. by their names as a fault,[98] the learned pandit censured the poet of Srīnātha's calibre very severely. The poet perhaps wanted his readers to understand that the story dealt with in the poem is up to the consummation of the marriage of Nala and Damayanti, but never conceivably expected or hoped that they would realise *śṛṅgāra rasa* by directly mentioning the word. If this charge were levelled against Pinavīrabhadra for assigning the title of Śṛṅgārasākuntalam to his poem, there might be some justification.

This deploroble state of affairs in literary criticism is perhaps worse in the case of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Many articles and introductions and some books and even a commentary have

been written on the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. The common drawback as it appears with all these critics is that they approach the poem with some preconceived notions or pet theories. They seem to forget that here is the work of a poet who might have something to portray, and in consequence fail to judge him on his own principles. If one tries to approach Shakespeare from the standpoint of the ālamkārika, and Kālidāsa from that of western literary criticism or from personal predisposition, then the works of these world-famous writers are likely to appear altogether in a different light and lose most of their beauty. Unfortunately this sort of approach seems to be gaining ground in Telugu literature. If the past has judged poets from the point fo view of Sanskrit literature, the present is perhaps repeating it from the standpoint of western crtiticism. Added to this, modern critics influenced by the west appear to estimate a poet taking some other poet as an absolute criterion. The most important person to advocate this method is Matthew Arnold. This may be useful in determining commercial values, but does not help in the least in the realisation of aesthetic values. On the other hand, this path is paved with so many graves. Suppose one starts with the conception that Nannaya is the best poet and begins to judge other writers using his lines as touch-stones; the result will be conceivably disconcerting. Tikkana with his limpid and halting style. devoid of all romantic imagery, will cut a very poor figure. His realism, his deeper understanding of human motives and aspirations, his dramatic presentation, his skill in characterisation, all these will most probably be missed. Not only that; new beauties that are brought to light by adopting the language of the common man and by depicting people who are in the lower rung of life as in the Kanyasulkam will generally be lost sight of. Besides, the selection of the touch-stone itself, when logically viewed, will be arbitrary and irrational. By this apparently wrong approach critics seem to have contributed more to confusion than to an appreciation of Surana. They have pointed to more than twenty drawbacks which they regard as major blemishes in the theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. To go through them will certainly throw a flood of light on the object and purport of the poem.

The first objection raised by Dr. C.R. Reddy is to the part played by the *maṇihāra* endowed with supernatural powers. Though a most beautiful creation, he says, it is not without fault.[99] The reasons he gives are as follows:- (1) Sugraha who obtained the Maṇihāra as a boon from Viṣṇu lost it even before experiencing the truth of it. (2) The Brahmin who happened to pick it up did not wear it but simply kept it in his box for years together, only to present it in the end to Sri Kṛṣṇa. (3) Really the Brahmin's wife should have been a great woman to stand above these temptations. Later on, when it was presented to Maṇikaṇdhara, he also could not enjoy the benefits of its supernatural powers. Ultimately it adorned the neck of the baby with its central gem touching her heart and thus manifesting its powers. It once again managed to get out of its place just before it revealed the past history of Satvadātman. Madhuralālasa did not even remember it after her marriage. Added to this, she had it lengthened so that when worn the central gem touched her heart.

All these points, he argues, are a mere bundle of accidents; and they are to him as unconvincing as assuming the form of the other. These arguments, on closer examination, appear to have been gathered together in support of his contention that the latter part of the poem commencing from the 189th stanza of the sixth canto is superfluous and unnecessary. Whatever may be the object, is he justified in criticising this part played by the *maṇihāra?* His main argument is that it is not convincing. For argument's sake let this point be conceded. If this is not convincing, do the supernatural powers attributed to it, at least from his standpoint, sustain and strengthen the world of make-believe? What about the divine powers of Mṛgēndravāhana? Has he not taken all these for granted? The very fact that he has taken so much pains proves beyond doubt that he concedes these supernatural powers to Maṇihara and Mṛgēndravāhana. Then why does he take objection to the part later played by the necklace? Granting these supernatural powers, what prevents him from taking them as probabilities? Is there any inhrent logical contradiction? He has not pointed it out.

His personal dislike for the latter part of the poem seems to have inspired these apparently untenable arguments. For example, he says that Sugraha was cursed even before he experienced the power of the *maṇihāra*.[100] This is apparently an exaggeration. What the poet actually says through Madhuralālasa is this[101]:-

చ. ...ఇఁక నేమి చెప్పఁదు జనాధిప యాయతిముఖ్యుఁ డంత నె
మ్మనమునఁ బట్టలేక ప్రతిమ న్బిగియారఁ గవుంగిలించె నిం
పొనరఁగ లేచి వచ్చి కడ నొక్క మఱుంగున నప్డు సుగ్రహుం
డునికి యెఱుంగమి న్నగియె నుండఁగ లే కితఁడున్ గికాకికన్.

వ. నగుటయు నతం డది వినియు విననిచందంబుఁ గల్పించుకొని తత్ప్రతిమాలింగనం
బొక యదృచ్ఛాచేష్టావి వేషంబుగాఁ గల్పించుటకుఁ దాత్కాలిక యుక్తి నద్దేవాలయంబున
వెండియుం గల దౌవారికాదిప్రతిమల నట్ల యాలింగనంబు చేయుచు నమస్కరించి
తత్ప్రదక్షిణంబు సేయం దొడంగిన సుగ్రహుండును నతని కపట చేష్టల తెఱం గెఱింగి
యి ట్లెంత చేసినఁ బూర్వంపుఁ జేఁత నే నెఱుంగుదునుగదా యది మఱవ ననుచు మఱియుఁ
బరిహసించె దాన నయ్యతి........[102]

The underlined words in the above passage clearly show that Sugraha utlised the *maṇihāra* to ascertain the real motive when the ascetic embraced other idols to conceal his emotions. Otherwise Sugraha could not have so positively asserted his opinion and ridiculed his behaviour. The nature of the curse also substantiates this point.

The next point which contributes to an air of improbability according to the critic is that the Brahmin did dot use the *manihara* and find its powers, and that he had preserved it for many years. At least, the critic opines, his wife should have sought to wear it even secretly because the love of jewels in women is naturally great. From the context of the criticism it appears that the critic wants the poet to delineate another episode in which the wife of the Brahmin makes a scene for the *manihāra*. If the poet had done it, fortunately for one he has not, the unity of the poem perhaps would have gone to pieces. Besides, it would have certainly defeated the poet's object, the explanation of which is deferred to a subsequent chapter. Above all these, if the poet had

done what this critic wanted, he would have violated the princi-ples of psychology of the poor and religious minded couple. Suppose, a rich man presents a most beautiful and costly garment to a husband and wife who are in stark poverty and who are always dressed in rags. They are most likely not to wear it. On the other hand, they may even try their level best to get rid of it or hide it. Even in nineteen fifties there are Erukulās who do not and dare not wear complete clothing. So also is this Brahmin couple. They should have been poor and religious minded. Because the *maṇihāra* is picked up at the temple, and because it is costly, it is kept safely without ever being used. Even if the couple had used it secretly, the chances of finding its supernatural powers were practically nil for they would be manifested only when the central gem touched the human heart. Due to poverty, it is natural for the couple not to know the nature of jewels and how to wear them. Now is that unconvincing and beyond probability? Thus *maṇihara* passes into the hands of Kṛṣṇa. Simply because it falls into his hands it cannot grow in its size. Quoting these lines

బా, లతఁ గనుపట్టు విష్ణుని కలాపము గావున తద్భుజాంతర
స్థితి కిది చాల కొప్పె గళ సీమన యెంతయు గుప్తమై........ [103]

he questions the appropriateness of the phrase 'బాలతఁగనుపట్టు'. Twisting the argument, he asks whether the Brahamin presented the *maṇihara* toKṛṣṇa after he had married sixteen thousand Gōpikās, or before, when he was only a child? He would not have raised this irrelevant question had he not apparently overlooked these verses:-

సీ. కొమరొందు మఱ్ఱియాకునఁ బవ్వళించి చూ
పట్టెడు బాలరూపంబుతోడఁ
బాణియుగ్మంబునఁ బదిలంబుగాఁ బట్టి
మొగమున నిడు పదాంబుజముతోడఁ
జరణాంగుళీపాన జాత లాలాభిషి
క్తం బైన చిన్ని హారంబుతోడఁ
బూని మాద్యులకు బ్రహ్మానంద శైత్యంబు
గులుకు నెయ్యపు ముద్దుఁ జెలువుతోడ

అతని మనమున నతిరతధ్యాన మహిమఁ
దిరముగాఁ బాదుకొన్నట్టి యరిది రూపు
వెలిఁ బ్రకాశింపఁ జేయుచు విష్ణుదేవుఁ
డధిక కారుణ్యలీలఁ బ్రత్యక్షమయ్యె.

క. ఆ తెఱఁగునఁ బ్రత్యక్షం
బై తను నిష్టమును వేఁడు మని హరి పలుకం
బ్రీతివశత నించుక తడ
వీతం డేమియును బలుక నెఱుఁగక యుండెన్.

వ. ... అద్దేవదేవుండు తనమెడ నున్న రత్నహారంబుఁ దిగిచి దీని
నాయకరత్నం బెవ్వరి హృదయస్థలంబున నెంతతడవు సోఁకి
యుండు వారికి నంతతడవును సర్వజ్ఞత్వంబును సకలవాక్పటు
త్వంబును గలిగియుండుననియును బ్రాహ్మణమనోవ్యథ గావించు
వారియొద్ద నిదియుండ దనియు నానతిచ్చి యతని చేతికి నద్దివ్య
హారంబు నిచ్చి యంతర్ధానంబు నొందె. [104]

But Viṣṇu did not say that the *manihāra* would adjust its size with the wearer. The Brahmin presented that Maṇihāra of Bala Viṣṇu to Sri Kṛṣṇa who had many wives. The same *maṇihāra*, when presented to Manikandhara and put on, hung close to his neck; but its central jewel did not touch his heart. Where is the inappropriateness? At this juncture another idea may strike the reader. Just as Madhuralālasa enlarged the *maṇihāra* so that the central gem touched the heart when worn, so also Maṇikandhara should have done it. What prevented him from doing it? Being a *gandharva*, he cannot be said to be ignorant of jewels. Since he is a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, and the *maṇihāra* a present from him in token of his poetic faculty, it is a keep-sake for him. Madhuralalasa's position, on the other hand, is quite different. She is deeply in love with her husband and wants to please him by wearing his present in an attractive way. Hence, it may be presumed that there is nothing unnatural, or unconvincing, or inappropriate in it.

The last objection is raised on two grounds. Firstly, even when Madhuralālasa was only a child, she was over head and ears in love with Kalāpūrṇa. She should have remembered the *maṇihāra* presented to her by her lover. Even if one is able to invent some excuse for this, he cannot explain why she did not remember it at the time of their marriage. This is clearly a violation of the law of association. Secondly, why did she entertain the idea of enlarging the *maṇihāra* so that the central gem might tough the heart? These two questions give rise to the thought that the critic might have forgotten the previous incident as well as the heroine's social status and culture. The *maṇihāra* was presented to her when she was only a baby of a few months, Further to remember such things in latter life or even in childhood is a psychological impossibility. Only elders who were present on that occasion might be expected to remember it. They did not remember it because they were not directly concerned with Kalāpūrṇa but only with Madhuralālasa. If they had been as much worried as Madhuralāsa about the here, they would have certainly remembered it. Or, if they had seen the Maṇihāra, they would have reminded the heroine of it. This latter probability also is ruled out by two causes:- firstly, it was safely kept away, and secondly, they did not feel its necessity due to abundance of jewellery. The second adverse reason also loses its force when one remembers that the very form of jewels suggests to men or women of culture, how they are to be worn. The heroine, devoted as she was to her husband, put on that *maṇihāra* with slight changes required for presenting a proper appearance without becoming the butt of ridicule.

Overlooking these implications, the great critic pronounces a severe judgment against the poet. He does not stop with this, but prescribes certain general rules even to Sūrana who had a thorough grasp of these aesthetic problems when he remarks:-

లోకములో నదృష్టములు, నిర్హేతుకములు నైన యాకస్మికములు లేకపోలేదు గాని, పదేపదే వలసినచోట్ల నెల్ల కాకతాళీయ న్యాయము నాశ్రయించుట కల్పనకు మిక్కిలి గొంత కావు రూపములు, దివ్యదృష్టి, ఇత్యాదులు అన్ని కష్టములకు ననుకూలించు

సాధనములుగాని, బ్రశస్తములు గావు. సర్వసందర్భములలోఁ జేరఁ జాలినవి యీ కథలోఁ దప్పక జేర్పఁ దగిన యంశము లని చెప్ప వీలులేదు గనుక, నిట్టి వే సందర్భములను జేరకుండుట మేలు.....[105]

This judgment naturally raises many problems like accident, rationality, probability, etc. If what is said above is completely valid, the stories of the Spider, the Elephant and the Serpent in Dhūrjati's poem, the dramatic works of Maeterlink, the Brand and the Peergynt of Ibsen and the like must be absolutely worthless. On the contrary, it is generally agreed among the critics and creative artists that they are of immense value and matchless beauty. The natural corollary is that probability in art or literature is not directly related to naturalism or materialistic realism. Aristotle in his Poetics made a serious effort to define the nature of probability but perhaps with little success... His approach is more apologetic than revelatory when he says:-

Speaking generally, one has to justify (1) the impossible by reference to the requirements of poetry, or to the better, or to opinion. For the purposes of poetry a convincing impossibility is preferable to an unconvincing possibility; and if men such as Zeuxis depicted be impossible, the answr is that it is better they should be like that, as the artist ought to improve on his model. (2) The improbable, one has to justify either by showing it to be in accordance with opinion, or by urging that at times it is not improbable; for there is a probability of things happening also against probability. (3) The contradictions found in the poet's language one should first test as one does an opponent's confutation in a dialectical argument, so as to see whether he means the same thing in the same relation and in the same sense before admitting that he has contradicted either something he has said himself or what a man of sound sense assumes as true. But there is no possible apology for improbability of plot or depravity of character when they are not necessary and no use is made of them, like the improbability in the appearance of Aegeus in Medea and the baseness of Menelaus in Orestes.[106]

Abhinavagupta enumerates seven obstacles in the realisation of *rasa* of which improbability is one. Bhārata devotes a considerable part to analyse the nature and characteristics of the divine, the semi-divine, the human, and the animal worlds, and customs and habits, and dresses and languages in various societies in his stupendous work Natyasastra.[107] But all these seem to leave yet something unsaid and the question eludes satisfactory solution. Perhaps this is due to ever evolving human nature and the existence of various levels of intelligence and culture. Due to these differences, what appears probable to some seems improbable to others. Yet one has to arrive at a fairly good standard by which the differences can be reconciled if one wants to avoid chaos in literary criticism. May it be put like this? :- However impossible an event may appear, and seem to be removed far from truth, scientific or otherwise, it becomes probable and convincing provided it forms an integral organic, and at the same time indispensable part and that it does not contradict directly or indirectly a part or the whole to which it belongs. Of course poetic licences or *kavisamayās* are an exception. It is well known to artists and critics that the world of beauty is completely inaccesible to those that do not admit the premises with which a work of art begins. When concession of this is followed by self-contradiction, one can impeach the artist for an improbability. In spite of this, incidents may be flat and devoid of beauty. They must be certainly criticised but not on the basis of improbability and unconvincing nature. Perhaps Dr. C.R. Reddy has been misguided by overlooking this aspect. When it becomes probable, one may not be convinced. Such cases are not altogether lacking, but the fault then lies not with the poet or artist but with oneself. So Abhinavagupta clearly says that the critic or *sahṛdaya* must be in such a position as to be able to identify himself with those to be described by the poet. The dispute between Isvara and Natkira in the Srī-kālahastimahatmyam[108] is worth noting in this context. Since a discussion of this is not the immediate concern of this essay, it is left out.

The second fault attributed to this work by Dr. C.R. Reddy[109] and indirectly supported by Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyana Sāstri[110] is that the portion from the 189th verse of the sixth canto to the end of the poem is not only devoid of imagination, genius and poetic faculty, but is also superfluous. The marriage of Madhuralālasa etc., he says, has already been suggested and nothing significant will be gained by describing them once again. Moreover, he opines, these incidents are not closely related to the main story. Mr.Sūryanārāyana Sāstri seems to follow the former in his footsteps when he says that the story of Kalāpūrṇa ends with the 192nd verse of the sixth canto, and that the rest may be called The Victory of Kalāpūrṇa or The Marriage of Madhuralālasa. If this criticism is right, the poet must be said to have committed a grave blunder, and the theme to have a horrible cancer in its body.

So it is of considerable importance to examine the reasons they advance, and the validity they possess. Dr. C. R. Reddy, in dealing with the so-called superfluous part, seems to be contributing more heat than light. The reasons he points out are:- Firstly, how is it possible for Kalāpūrna to forget Madhuralālasa who had as a baby revealed so many wonderful things, and who was the daughter of his vassal king living in the neighbourhood, Secondly, the love of Madhuralālasa for Kalāpūrṇa as depicted in this part is mean and inappropriate. Thirdly, how did she recognise her lover though she had not seen him even once before? Fourthly, the mother's advice on the eve of her departure to her husband's place is devoid of any significance. Fifthly, there is neither interesting story nor arresting imagination. The jealousy between Abhinavakaumudi and Madhuralālasa, the cause of Kalāpūrṇā's expedition of victory, and Satvadātman's political advice are silly, and only brought in to fulfil the rules presecribed by the ālamkārikās. Had not Kalāpūrṇa obtained an invincible bow and arrows and subjugated the emperor Madāśaya? What necessity is there for him to enter into a nonaggression pact with the Magadha king and undertake an expedition of victory a second time? Sixthly, using only one of the four forces in every battle

is unrealistic. Mention of bombs, guns and rifles (ఫిరంగులు, జజురుజంగులు, తుపాకులు) as having been used in these battles is gross anachronism. Kalāpūrṇa according to Sūrana, is a contemporary of Parīksit and to describe Kalāpūrṇa as having become the sole emperor is inappropriate. Whatever creation is quite contradictory to the world-famous stories is not appropriate. Seventhly, the age of Sūgraha is beyond comprehension. He should have spent some years to obtain the manihara and some years should have passed before it reached Krsna. From the time it was presented to Maṇikandhara to that when Madhuralālasa wore it a second time thirty years at least should have passed. So his age is a regular paradox. To these veritable incongruities, he says, one finds no end. Why was not Satvadātman recognised by his own sister Rūpānubhūti? If it was due to the curse, it had deprived him only of his memory but not of his body. Nor can it be supported on the ground that he had no access to the harem and so his sister did not happen to see him because he is said to have met Kalāpūrṇa and his wife Madhuralālasa in his harem Under point six another question is raised. When was Dvaraka submerged under the sea, before Kalāpūrna came to the throne or after that event? If it was before, it was too late, and if it was afterwards, did he fight with Kṛṣṇa, Balarāma, Bhīma and Arjuna? Eighthly, Abhinavakaumudi who remained a barren woman for many years, gave birth to a son late in her thirties. Her conception creates rather suspicion than revelation of beauty. And lastly, the episode of Lakṣmi-Nārāyaṇa-Samvāda does not fit into the picture and become an integral part.

Regarding the first objection, the poet anticipating the critic has given suggestively a reply[111] with which the latter is not satisfied. The time lapse of more than sixteen years suggested by the discription of the gradual growth of Madhuralalasa from childhood to maidenhood has not convinced him of this probability. He presists in saying that to forget her who has releaved such wonderful things is highly improbable. It may be recollected here that she manifested these supernatural powers only once and that these powers too failed her in the middle.

This failure might have made Kalāpūrṇa and others that were present at that juncture to attribute them to some unknown factor and not to Madhuralālasa. Moreover, she did not exhibit such wonderful powers even once after that event. How could she remain in Kalāpūrṇā's memory even after sixteen years? Even great people who have sacrificed everything to their nation and humanity at large are being consigned to oblivion within a span of three or four years. When such is the clear testimony of history, is there any scope for doubting the poet's statement that Kalāpūrna forgot everything about Madhuralālasa? Is it not well-known to politicians that public memory is very short?. Leaving all these arguments, one has, if he is a critic, to believe implicitly in what the poet says as long as it remains uncontradicted by any other utterance in the same work. This point of dispute becomes all the clearer if one takes for example Kalidasa's Meghasandesa. Every student knows that a message to be conveyed to Yakṣini is imparted by the Yakṣha to the cloud. Viewed realistically, nothing can be more absurd than this; but one timely stroke from the great poet shatters this improbability to pieces. Voicing the doubt of the critic or *sahrdaya*, he replies with an *arthañtaranyāsa*.

> ధూమ జ్యోతి స్సలిల మరుతాం సన్నిపాతః క్వమేఘః
> సందేశార్థాః క్వపటుకరణైః ప్రాణిభిః ప్రాపణీయాః
> ఇ త్యౌత్సుక్యా దపరిగణయన్ గుహ్యక స్తం యయాచే
> కామార్తాహి ప్రకృతికృపణా శ్చేతనాచేత నేషు. [112]

మేఘదూతము 1-5

If the critic is not satisfied even after reading the last line, apparently he expresses only an opinion as distinct from criticism.

Turning to the second allegation that the love as depicted here is mean and inappropriate, the critic seems to overlook the fact that an aesthetic object is quite different from a natural or social object. Characters like Rāvaṇa, Sakara, lady Macbeth, Satan etc. are objects of wonder and beauty, but as real human beings in flesh and blood, living amidst mortals, they are not only

horrible but also intolerable. It behoves society to get rid of such aberrations of creation. Such is the gulf between the objects of beauty and the objects of nature. This statement naturally leads to the consideration of the problem of beauty 119 which is to be dealt whith in a subsequent chapter. For the present it may be sufficient to say that social ethics is quite different from that of Fine Arts. Dr.Reddy appears to attack the poet for depicting this love situation purely on ethical grounds and social progress. This bias might have set up a thick screen between him and the beauties to be found in the description of a young bud gradually blooming into the fullgrown flower of Madhuralālasa, in the brisk and running narration in appropriate metres and facile expression. Moreover, given that royal status, there seems to be nothing unconvincing or improbable or inappropriate in Madhuralālasa. To condem a part containing such verses as the following is rather strange :-

38

క. పుట్టకతొల్లియ యెక్కడ
నిట్టివి నేర్చె తని చూప తెల్లను జెక్కుల్
ముట్టుచు లాలింపఁగ నా
చిట్టికలికి చిందులాడు క్షితిపతిఁ దడవన్ .

సీ. ఆ పిన్నపాప దా నంతయ్యై యింతయ్యై
యోలి నొయ్యన బాల్యకేళి వదలె
మగవారియెదుటఁ బల్మరు నుండుటకుఁ గొంకెఁ
దఱచుగా రాదయ్యెఁ దండ్రితొడకు
నంగకంబులబాగు లరసి యోమఁ దొడంగె
సడలనీదయ్యె నెప్పుడును పైఁట
క్రేవ్ఫుఁజూపులఁ గలికితనంబు పస నేర్చెఁ
బలుకుచో బొమ లార్చు భంగు లెఱిఁగె

గీ. మదురుఁ బ్రాయంపుఁ బడఁతుల మదన కథలు
పాడుచో సిగ్గువడి పాఱిపోవఁ జొచ్చె
శైశవముఁ బాఱ నొత్తుచు జవ్వనంబు
క్రమముతో నంతకంతకుఁ గానిపింప.[114]

The third objection on the ground of impossibility of Madhuralālasa's recognising Kalāpūrṇa even at the time of their first meeting loses its force if one only remembers Brahma's words. He says :-

మీయమ్మశాపంబునకు నోఁ గాదన నెవ్వరికి నెట్లు వచ్చు నది
యట్లనుభవించి తదనంతరజన్మంబున కళాపూర్ణుండను రాజునకు
భార్యవై యనన్య సాధారణంబైన యైశ్వర్యభోగంబు లనుభ
వించుచు సహజంబైన పరమ పాతివ్రత్యంబున సకల ధర్మంబులు
సాధించి కృతార్థవయ్యెదు.[115]

From the underlined words it is clear that Madhuralālasa is blessed with a boon of having an inborn love for her husband. Due to this blessing she is able to recognise her would-be husband. This point has not been brought into the picture all on a sudden. The poet has clearly mentioned it not once but twice in describing her childhood. Reminding his reader who is likely to forget Brahma's boon, the poet says :-

బ్రహ్మవచనసామర్థ్య లబ్ధం బైన సహజపాతివ్రత్యంబునంజేసి యా
సమయంబున.

చ. పొలుపుగ దన్ను వే నిదురపుచ్చుటకై తమతల్లి పైఁడి యు
య్యల నిడి యూఁపుచున్ గువలయాధిపు పాటలు పాడినం గరం
బలరుచుఁ గేరి కేరి నగు నన్యులపాటలు పాడినం గరం
బలుకుచు నేడ్చు లోకు లవురా పతిభక్తియటంచు నవ్వఁగన్[116]

In her childhood Madhuralālasa is again described :-

క. పుట్టక తొల్లియ యొక్కడ
సిట్టిఁ నేర్చి తని చూపె తెల్లను జెక్కుల్
ముట్టుచు లాలింపఁగ నా
చిట్టికలికి చిందులాడు క్షితిపతిఁ దడవన్.[117]

When she was able even in her babyhood to recognise and respond to the simple name, what improbability is there when she is said to have recognised Kalāpūrṇa at their first meeting ? If this is improbable the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha becomes all the more improbable and thus the whole of the

Kalāpūrṇōdayam loses all its significance. Whether this concept of pātivratya is good or bad, is irrelevant here. The question is whether the peculiar behaviour logically follows from the previous incidents or not. Brahma definitely told that parrot that she would, in her second birth, marry Kalapurna and that the qualities of *pātivratya* would be natural and not acquired as the results of psychological process. This boon is confirmed once again by Sumukhāsatti[118] when she blessed Kalabhāṣiṇi that she would become a *parama pativrata* in her next birth. Her words are not simply an expression of her ardent hope because she acquired such supernatural powers from Mrgendravahana that whatever she expressed would become true. Hence this point, Madhuralālasa recognising Kalāpūrṇa at their first meeting, is doubly determined as perfectly consistent and gives no scope for doubt.

The fourth allegation seems to be more unjustified than any other mentioned by the critic. Sending away the married daughter to her husband's house is an important and memorable event for a mother even to this day. Even when she marries her daughter to her own brother and sends her to her husband's house for the first time immediately after marriage, tears fill her eyes. This natural emotion and the customary advice of the mother are given expression to by the poet through Rupanubhuti. Even though there is full scope here for teaching the duties of a housewife, Surana does not indulge in it; on the contrary, dismisses it in only six verses[119] taking care not to bring in irrelevant points.

The fifth objection appears to have its root in the conception of poetry itself. According to this view, it seems, poetry consists only in carefully consturucted story, or incidient, or character delineation. For those who hold this view simple descriptions of things, moods, emotions, ideas, culture etc. have no value. Fine imagery, beautiful word-music, bewitching melody, subtle rhythm, all these are worthless extravagance. If one accepts this view, Kalidasa's Meghasandesa, Muyūra's Sūryasataka, Dhūrjati's Sri-Kāla-hastīsvara-sataka, Kasula Puruṣōttama's Āndhranāyaka Sataka, Nācana Sōmanā's Uttara harivaṁsa, the famous odes

and sonnets in English and Greek literatures must be considered insignificant and worthless. All efforts made by the aestheticians and the *ālamkārikās* since the time of Plato, according to this view, will be a colossal waste. Therefore, this theory of poetry is neither supported by the existing works of art, nor upheld by any school of aesthetics. This argument, however, does not concede directly or indirectly that this part of the poem is altogether devoid of story interest. On the other hand, in addition to the interest of the theme, there are beautiful descriptions which are not so conspicuous in the earlier part. For example the childhood of Madhuralālasa, the jocular way in which the old purohit prattles with the king, the scenes on the battle-field and the feelings of the soldiers when they once again come in sight of their native city after a long and protracted absence are more than beautiful.

The cause of Kalāpūrṇā's expedition of victory which the critic ridicules is not probably so absurd as it is made to appear if one only refers to modern history of Europe. How many silly causes, personal prejudices, private affairs of the diplomatic personages and mere accidents have precipitated horrible conflicts and disastrous wars ? Hindu polity, besides, insists that a king worth his name should never be satisfied until the whole earth is brought under his domination. Kalāpūrṇa, when he undertook this expedition, did nothing more than follow this injunction which has its roots deeply set in the psychology of political leaders. The next question whether the jealousies of Abhinavakaumudi and Madhuralālasa bring them any credit, and whether their respective characters are not marred, does not count if the social and cultural background of those times is taken into consideration. Kṛṣṇa is depicted as having invaded heaven only to bring the *parijata*, and Bhima for having attacked *gandharvas* for the sake of *saugandhika* flowers. No purpose will be served by viewing artistic creations with the bias of the modern age. Moreover, such outlook is strictly barred by the canons of artistic taste and valuation.

G V. Krishna Rao

The satirical remark hurled by the critic at Satvadātman's political advice probably loses it's sting, when its actual content is taken into account. Satvadātman does not teach the A.B.C of politics, but only mentions the points that encourage the king in his mission and openly admits that they are not new to the king well-versed in that science.

The next questions which the critic poses as his own, is raised and answered by Satvadātman himself. The critic in his own way remarks :-

> స్వభావుఁ డిచ్చిన విల్లునమ్ములు నుండ మాగధుని మైత్రి యెందుకు.
> ఏటిలో వేయుటకా? ఈ దిగ్విజయముగూడ సందర్భశుద్ధి లేనిది.
> ఏలన? మదాశయుడు సకలరాజులు గెలుచునట్లు వరంబుగొన్న
> వాడగుట నత డట్లు చేసి సార్వభౌముండై యుండఁగా, నతనిని
> కళాపూర్ణుడు గెల్చె నన్న నీ యధిక ప్రసంగము లన్నియు నివా
> రితములై యుండును. అవును, 'ఆ జీ' యని సూత్ర మున్నదే.
> ఇంత సర్వలక్షణప్రాప్తికి దానిని మెడ గట్టుకోవలదా? [120]

One may refer to what Satvadātman says anticipating these objections.

> ఆ. సకలదిగ్జయంబు సలిపినయట్టి మ
> దాశయుని జయించి నపుడె సిద్ధ
> మెల్లదిశల నీదు కీర్తికు సాగుట
> యైన నృపులశాంతి యస్థిరంబు.

> వ. కావున నీవును జని యానడుమ నంకురితదర్పు లగుచు నెదు
> ర్పం గడంగు గడుసుదొర లెక్క డెక్కడం గలరో వారి
> నుక్కడంచి దిక్కుఁ నప్రతిహతంబుగా ధవళాతపత్రంబు
> నెఱపుట తగిన కార్యంబు.[121]

No one can say that the critic has not seen these lines and that he thinks that his objection was never in the poet's view. Nevertheless, he raises this point probably to say that he is not completely convinced with Satvadātman's explanation. Keeping the following points in view critics may judge the issue :- Firstly, kalāpūrṇa conquered only Madāśaya who had conquered all the

other kings. He never established his sovereignty over them by practically exhibiting his armed might and prowess. Secondly, defeating the emperor will not bestow sovereignty all the kings are once again subjugated. There can be no clearer example in this respect than the victory of Khaljis over the kākatīya emperor and the victory of the Sultans of Deccan kingdoms over the emperor of Vijayanagar. Thirdly, more than twenty years had passed since Kalāpūrṇa defeated Madāśaya. There is sample scope for antagonistic forces to gain fresh strength. Fourthly, somple boons do not automatically establish sovereignty. Though Arjuna acquired *pāsupātāstra*[122] blessed with victory, the terrible war of kuruksetra did not cease to take its disastrous course.

The sixth charge brought against the poet is anachronism. Genarally, speaking, lack of historical sense seems to be one of the drawbacks with the Indian writers and especially with the philosophers. But all the same Sūrana cannot be accused on this score. This critic observes that the poet has committed this blender by mentioning bombs, guns and rifles (ఫిరంగులు, జబురుజంగులు, తుపాకులు) as having been used in the times of Kalāpūrṇa. In this context what is more useful than an argument is to go through the account of Salva's attack on Dvāraka described in the Aranya parvam of the Mahābhārata.[123] There it is vividly said that the King Sālva carried on an arrial attack on Dvāraka from his Saubhanagaradhya which could fly to any place and the latter, which repulsed the attack, is thus described:

> సయంత్ర ఖనకంబును, సోపశల్య ప్రతోలికంబును...సాట్టాలక
> గోపురంబును, సతోమరాంకుశంబును, సశతఘ్నీక లాంగలంబును,
> సపరశ్వధ లోభ చర్మంబును,...నైన మా ద్వారవతీపురంబు.[124]
>
> (శ్రీ) కృష్ణ భారత. ఆరణ్య. ఆ 1. వ. 261–263

Thus there is a clear mention of *sataghni* and other instruments of destruction. It may be argued that the text quoted here is spurious, and that it might have crept into the Mahābhārata recently. Spurious or not, this passage must have got into the text even before the time of Pingali Surana. The poet, who had thoroughly studied the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyana, simply believed in the authenticity of this passage and used the current

names of his time. There are definite references to such instruments of destruction in the Sukranitisāra[125] a treatise on politics, and the Uttaraharivamsam, a poem.[126] If there still any error of anachronism at all, it is to be attributed to the earlier writers but not to Surana.

The next point that Kalāpūrṇa must have been a contemporary of Parīkṣit certainly true. Because he had great respect for the Bhārata, Sūrana did not even mention the name of Parīkṣhit or others of Kurukṣētra fame. To that extent he prevented his theme from coming into direct coflict with the story of the Mahābhārata. Strict adherence to historical events and dates is not as important for the poet as creating beauty. The general rule to be followed in this respect is the dictation of beauty. The critic's dictum, that whatever is contradictory to the world-famous stories is inappropriate,[127] seems to be rather a hasty conclusion. If what he says is right, even a minor change in a world-famous story is undesirable and repulsive. But there are many dramatists who must be accused on this ground. For example, one dramatist changes one of the most well-known incidents in the Rāmāyaṇa when he makes Laksmana follow the wonderful deer instead of Rama. Moreover, this effective change is applauded very much by Kuntaka as an instance under *Prakaraṇa Vakrata.*[128]

Discussing this problem Dhvanyālōka says :-

సంతి సిద్ధరసప్రఖ్యా యే చ రామాయణాదయః,
కథాశ్రయా నతైర్యోజ్యా స్వేచ్ఛా రసవిరోధినీ.[129]
తేషు కథాశ్రయేషు లావ త్స్వేచ్ఛైవ నయోజ్యా, యదుక్తమ్ -
కథామార్గేన చాతిక్రమః, స్వేచ్ఛాపి యది యోజ్యా తద్రస
విరోధినీ నయోజ్యా. ఇద మపరం ప్రబంధస్య రసాభివ్యంజకత్వే
నిబంధనమ్. ఇతివృత్తవశాయాతాం కథంచి ద్రసాననుగుణాం
స్థితిం త్యక్త్వా పున రుత్ప్రేక్ష్యా ప్యనంతరభీష్ట రసోచిత కథో
న్నేయో విధేయః. యథా కాలిదాస ప్రబంధేషు, యథాచ
సర్వసేనవిరచితే హరివిజయే, యథాచ మదీయ ఏ వార్జున చరితే
మహా కావ్యే. కవినా ప్రబంధ ముపనిబధ్నతా సర్వాత్మనా

రసపరతంత్రేణ భవితవ్యమ్. తత్రేతివృత్తే యది రసాననుగుణాం
స్థితిం పశ్యేత్తం భంక్త్వాపి స్వతంత్రతయా రసానుగుణ కథాంతర
ముత్పాదయేత్. నహి కవే రితివృత్తమాత్రనిర్వహణేన కించి
త్ప్రయోజనమ్. ఇతిహాసదేవ తత్సిద్ధేః.

Here Sūrana neither changed the story of the Bhārata nor contradicted it. He silently passed over the story of Parīkṣit and that too with a definite object. If he described Kalāpūrna as having fought with Kṛṣṇa or Parīksit, it might be regarded as a blunder. Even then before convicting a writer of this charge, many other things have to be taken into consideration. Suppose an Englishman writes an epic in his own language depicting Rāma and Rāvana in an altogether different light with many changes in the theme; that poem for the English - speaking world does not become grotesque.

The seventh objection that Sātvadātman's age is beyond comprehension and that he appears in this respect to belong to *Krtayuga,* is hardly convincing. To conceive of Sugraha as losing his kingdōm at the age of twenty two or twenty five and obtaining the manihara in his thirtieth year does not strike one as an improbability. Even granting that the necklace remained with the Brahmin for ten years, and that thirty years had lapsed before Madhuralālasa came to wear it for the second time which this critic concedes Sugraha's age does not exceed seventy years. Even learning some more margin, one can take him to be seventy-five years old when he met Kalāpūrṇa and his wife in the harem. The next question why Rūpānubhūti did not recognise Satvadātman, suggests that this critic probably did not pay attention to the curse inflicted on Sugraha. It is as follows :-

యిది తుదిగా నీ మొదలిమేలుక యెంత గల దంతయు విస్మృతం
బయ్యెడు మని శాపం బిచ్చె......[130]

This means that the past history of Sugraha up to the end of the curse would be forgotten. Not only Sugraha, but also those who know him would not know his past. If the poet had meant only to make him lose his own consciousness up to that event, he would not have wasted so many words, and would have said :-

యిది తుదిగా నీకు నీ పూర్వజ్ఞాన మంతయు వినిహతం బయ్యెడు

మని శాపం బిచ్చె.

So it seems to be a case of inattention.

The eighth objection that Abhinnavakaumudi's conception after many years of married life leads one to doubt her chastity loses all its sharpness if it is only remembered that she belongs to the class of *gandhurvās*. On each one of the queens a son is bestowed not because the poet wants to be impartial, or to bring about symmetry which the critic ridicules. That the son begotten by Abhinavakaumudi is called Suprasāda, and the one by Madhuralālasa Sarasa, has a greater significance than what the critics have ever tried to probe into. For the present this point is left out only to be discussed at length in its proper context.

Now this survey and defence carried on so far is intended only to established that this later part of the poem is free from faults attributed to it by the critic. This is only a negative approach because a faultless poem need not necessarily be beautiful. Unless the positive beauties of this part are clearly shown, these arguments do not carry much weight. So this aspect forsooth needs a closer examination.

Suppose the poet had closed his poem with the 192nd verse of the sixth canto as our critic suggests; then the poem would not only be incomplete but also put the reader in a mood of irritation and dissatisfaction. He would be at a loss to understand firstly, how a baby which was not old enough to laugh could tell so many stories ; secondly, why her supernatural powers failed her suddenly ; thirdly, why Satvadātman was brought into the picture; and fourthly, why Maṇikaṇdhara was said to have hidden his vina so carefully in the temple of Mṛegēndravāhana. There is no point, therefore, in wishing that the poet had closed his poem with the 192nd verse of the sixth canto. Assuming tentatively that the poet had made the baby narrate the story of Sugraha also without a break, would the story suffer in any way? In that case it must also be granted that a baby of a few months can remained stiil for hours together without moving this side or that

side in the cradle. Those words informing the readers that Maṇikaṇdara had hidden his vina safely in the temple are to be omitted. Added to this one has to think of Brahma as somewhat talkative. If these are the only things with which the readers are concerned, they can be easily adjusted. But the most unfortunate thing is that the whole significance and meaning of the poem will be lost. It will only be a fairy - tale to please the young and the old, or a story to be newly added to the Kathāsaritsāgara. Not only that. One fourth of the existing poem becomes superfluous and unnecessary. *If this is true, the poet must be said to be the* most incompetent writer who does not even know where to end a story. That such an incapable poet can give a story that is atleast marvellous at a certain part is quiet incredible. Even that part which is considered the most beautiful will appear to be maried by many drawbacks if one does not approach it from the correct perspectives. If Dr.Reddy's approach is right, what purpose does it serve to mention the nature of poetry so many times in the poem? Why are Sugātri and Salina said to be the natives of Kashmir and not of some other country? The names of Caturmukha and Sarasvati can be replaced by Nārāyana and Lakṣmi, or Paramēśvara and Parvati. These points in the story cannot be settled according to this interpretation. The name of Kalāpūrṇa is not inevitable. This name can be changed into pūrṇa Candra. Above all, how is one to account for the failure of the poet in one fourth of the poem? It cannot be said that his Muse deserted him once for all at the end of the 192nd verse of the sixth canto. He wrote another marvellous poem after the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. These considerations, therefore, lead to the opinion that the critic might not have approached the poem from a proper angle.

Now to follow the critics in their further accusations. The third fault found with the theme is that the pilgrimage of Maṇikaṇdhara to holy places does not serve any other purpose than increasing the bulk of the poem.[130] Moreover, it positively spoils, they say, the beauty by enhancing the time gap. According to this view Kalabhāṣini is left in an awkward position. one is

at a loss to understand how she spent this period of one and a half years while Maṇikaṇdhara was on his pilgrimage. This criticism is partly met by Mr.Sūryanārāyana Sāstri in his commentary on the Kalāpūrṇōdayam[131] when he explains thus :- Firstly, this pilgrimage is a prelude to his penance, and Nārada had instructed the hero to follow his instruction. Secondly, the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is a poem and not a *sūtragrantha* to leave it to suggestiion. Thirdly, the poet is only making his work good by describing the sacred places of pilgrimage. Added to this, this description is suited to the Prabandha Marga. Fourthly, the poet who has given a story in ten verses sufficient enough for three cantos, cannot be said to be ignorant of what enhances and what hampers the tempo of the story. He is also playing the tune favoured by the people of his age.

In spite of this elaborate argument, one may still feel that the objection raised is not properly met. It is true that the poet has some partiality and considers it a sacred thing to go on a pilgrimage. This can be clearly proved by the prominence he gives to Arjuna's *tīrthayātra* at the expense of the story in his Rāghavapāndavīyam.[132] Nevertheless, this description seems to be important not on extraneous grounds but on internal necessity. Kalabhāṣini is not a simple and credulous maiden to be easily duped by Maṇistambha. If the description of holy places were omitted by him, could she have believed and implicitly followed him to achieve her end? He might have exhibited his supernatural powers and thus roused her checked ambitions. Well acquainted as she was with the ways of the world, would she have entrusted herself to an utter stranger? Without this description, what is there for Kalabhāsini to have implicit faith in him and to trust him with her life? In order to appear as a pious and god-fearing man Maṇistambha took every care to describe all the holy places with such faith and zeal that Kalabhāṣini did not hesitate to follow him. Even readers who happen to read the poem for the first time do not entertain any suspicion of his terrible intention.

The fourth allegation against the theme is that the child's exposition of Yōga is unnecessary, inappropriate and unpalatable.[133] This is plainly supported by another critic when he says that this is not in any way connected with the main story, and that it only helps to show the poet's knowledge of Yoga. It seems that these eminent critics have not paid proper attention to it.

To understand the importance of this exposition of Yōga it is to be recollected that the baby, Madhuralālasa, had narrated the wonderful episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha with the clue that she, in her previous birth as Kalabhāṣini, had seen the Maṇihāra with Maṇikandhara. Requested by Alaghuvrata, Kalāpūrṇa introduced himself, his minister and the other personages present on the scene. What would be the immediate reaction firstly, of the readers, and secondly, of the characters who heard this story? Because the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha is a continuation of the previous story, the readers naturally would not entertain any doubts. If they had anything to doubt at all, it would only be how the baby which was not old enough to laugh could know the past and narrate it to the audience. This point is kept in abeyance to maintain suspense. Now what are the reactions of the characters involved? This point appears to be by-passed by both these critics. Instead of being themselves *sahrdayās* who have no other business than to identify themselves with those to be described by the poet, they seem to insist upon the characters following them. But fortunately, one of the greatest poets and aestheticians that he was, Sūrana knew that the creatures of the poetic or aesthetic world have their own laws which cannot be violated without they being banished once for all from that world. Possessed with great insight, the poet also portrays the reactions of the characters. Kalāpūrṇa and his retinue were given the past history of their previous births and origination. They were put in such a position that they could neither confirm nor deny it. It is true that they were completely lost in wonder. Their past as revealed by the baby was so amazing and eulogistic that they did not want either to disbelieve or confirm it, because such an action would not affect them and

their position in the least. But the position of Alaghuvrata was quite different. He came there with the avowed purpose of hearing the story of Kalāpūrṇa; and on it his whole future depended. So it was of immense importance for him to verify the truth of the story. Of course the names of Kalāpūrṇa and his followers on the one hand, and Manikandhara, Kalabhāṣini and the Maṇihāra on the other, closely fitted into the narration of the baby. Yet Alaghuvrata had his own doubts not without justification. Suppose you are sitting on the beach along with some others whom you do not know. Presently a stranger comes and tells you and the others present, your names correctly and gives some details of your past births. What will be your reactions? Will you simply believe him and accept all that he tells you? Will you not try to test the astrologer by some other means?

The same is the reaction of Alaghuvrata in the story. When doubt arises as to the reality of a thing, there are only two kinds of test open to man-one intrinsic and the other extrinsic. Following this, his mind at once tried to find incongruities in the narration itself. The only thing that appeared to him incongruent and improbable was the strangeness in the parents of Kalāpūrna. Hence he questioned first the king and finally the baby how it was possible for a man actually to give birth to a child. The baby, blessed with temporary supernatural power, could probe into his mind, and after narrating the story of Manistambha and Sumukhāsatti exchanging their sexes and giving birth to Kalāpūrṇa, asked the audience to get the fact verified if they wanted, from Sumukhāsatti and Maṇistambha living Kasarapura.[134] Why did the baby bring in the question of verification if not to silence the doubts of Alaghuvrata? So this is a direct reply to Alaghuvrata though she asked all of them to verify it. Now the poor Brahmin was disarmed, and had to conceive of an objective or extraneous test by which he could know the truth. What could that be? His brain was working at full speed; and in the meanwhile the baby, continuing the story, told them how Svabhāva gave Kalāpūrṇa a bow, arrows and a jewel. Alaghuvrata, who still had doubts, and who was all the while thinking of a

method to test the truth, asked her why Svabhava bestowed all those gifts on Kalāpūrṇa. When she explained the connections of Svabhava and Kalāpūrṇa and the powers the former achieved through Yōga, Alaghuvrata found a way to test the truth in her narration.

Because his father was a *Yōgin* and he had learnt something about it, he wanted to test the knowledge of the baby. Unless she possessed genuine knowledge, she could not know the intricate secrets of sciences and philosophy. If she could give a correct interpretation to the science of which he knew something, then all the things she had been telling them could also be believed. Hence Alaghuvrata, assuming an air of great respect and modesty, requested her apparently without any relevinced to enlighten him on Yōga. When she explained it to them at length, he was completely convinced and was inclined to place immense faith in what she said. He went on questioning her on such matters as he wanted to know. When, towards the close, she told him that Prathamāgama etc. Were his sons, doubts were once again roused. Nevertheless, he was prepared simply to believe what she was about to say. That is why the poet makes him say in his characteristic way:-

101

ఆ. నాకుఁ జూడ ధరణినాయక యిది యసం
గతము యీ విచిత్ర కథల తల్లి
దీని కౌనర నేగతిని బట్టతలలు మో
కాళ్ళు ముళ్ళు పెట్టఁ గలదో కాని. [135]

Hence the exposition of Yōga does not seem to be superfluous as these critics think. It is presumably necessary from the standpoint of Alaghuvrata if not from that of the readers who want a story simple and plain to beguile the time. But some doubt may occur as to the necessity of such a lengthy exposition. Even this is likely to disapppear if one only remembers that Alaghuvrata is slow-witted.[136] This interpretation is apparently supported by two more considerations. The baby tells that Alaghuvrata's father is a great *yōgin*. What purpose does it serve to mention this particular quality in addition to others? If one

argues that these qualities are mentioned only to represent Somasarman as a great man, it may be valid in the case of any other poet than Sūrana. The qualities attributed to this character are only three: his knowledge of the Vedas, his greatness in penance and *yōga* and his affluence. Except the second, the rest are fully utilised for the later events. When the first and the third qualities are enough to keep the story moving, what purpose does it serve to mention the second? If they were not meant to serve actually any event in the story, they should have been simply ornaments. But that is not the case because without the first and the third qualities, the story would not have come into existence. When two epithets are endowed with such significance, how can one say that the third is superfluous? Hence the present interpretation is not unreasonable or arbitrary.

Finally, if the poet only wanted to show off his knowledge of *Yōga* or to preach it in order to endow his poem with a sacred subject, (punyavastuvarnanakarnanīya) he could have included the whole exposition in the story of Svabhava or Sōmaśarman who are said to be great yogins instead of introducing it by a special request of Alaghuvrata. These considerations, therefore, lead to the conclusion that the present interpretation is more probable.

The fifth point which the critic mentions as the most unsatisfactory thing in the theme is the representation of Kalabhāsiṇi as having been brought to life once again even after she was sacrificed to the goddess Mṛgēndravāhana. The critic's actual words are very interesting. He says:-

> ఇంత సుందర మగు పాత్రము వర్ణనము శోకాంతముగాఁ జెప్పుట
> కిష్టములేమిచేతనో, మఱి మనకవులకుం బట్టిన దౌర్భాగ్యమతంబు
> కతంబుననో, మణికంధర ఖండిత మస్తక యగు నా లలనా శిరో
> మణి కాళికాదేవి కరుణా ప్రసాదంబున పునస్సంహితమస్తకయు,
> నిజపురీవర్తినియు నై తన బంధుమిత్రాదుల నలరించుచు, సుమారు
> రెండు సంవత్సరములుండి పిమ్మటఁ గాలప్రాప్తమరణ యాయె నని
> కరుణారసప్రధాన మగు నీ భాగము యొక్క సొంపును గని వికలం

బోనర్చి యుండుట భాషాదుర్దశ గాదా? రసములలో శోకము
నొక్కటి. ఇది మాత్రము విశేష్య మన నేల? శోక ప్రధానముగా
వ్రాసినఁ గవిత్వము మొక్కవోవునా? మొత్తముమీద భారతమే
శోకాంతమట. దానికి రాని తక్కువ పెర వానికి వచ్చునా? [137]

Now the question is why the poet represented her as having been resuscitated. Her actual death rather than survival could have certainly enchanced or intensified *karuna* as the critic mentions. Did he fail to exploit the situation to the utmost as he alleges, or were there any other considerations that prevented him from following the open course?

The first thing to be noted is that the poet never meant or intended to write a regular tragedy in the Greek sense. His object was quite different, and he wanted to express something else which is to be discussed in the next chapter. Simply because a poet refuses to write a tragedy, no one, if one is fair, can find fault with him. Secondly, given the whole story as it is in the Kalapurnodayam, the particular episode of sacrificing Kalabhāṣiṇi to Mṛgēndravāhana by Maṇikaṇdhara cannot be a pure tragedy because both of them are destined to become the emperor and empress in their next births. When there is such an ardent hope and assured expectation how can it be a tragedy in the Greek sense ? So the question of making it a pure tragedy does not arise at all. Even the other argument that the poet should have represented Kalabhāṣiṇi as being not brought back to life again, cannot be maintained if the whole work is taken into consideration. The edict on the stone in front of Mṛgēndravāhana runs to the effect, that whoever sacrifices a beautiful courtezan well-accomplished in music enjoys unrivalled emperorship for long without any trouble. Maṇikaṇdhara incurred a curse from Nalakūbara to the effect that he would meet his death in short time. As a sacrificer of Kalabhāṣiṇi, he had to enjoy the fruit of the boon from Mṛgēndravāhana and at the same time undergo the curse of Nalakūbara. To avoid the conflict between these two, the curse and the boon, the poet had to create or bring to light some other factor. That factor is Maṇikaṇdhara's hesitation to sacrifice his

love, Kalabhāsiṇi, to Mṛgēndravāhana as a result of which the goddess ordained that he would enjoy enjoy the fruit in his next birth. Without this intervention the whole story would have been ruined beyond repair. The goddess who is sensitive to his hesitation cannot be said to be indifferent to Kalabhāṣiṇi's courage and purity of heart. And hence her survival. If the critic's view is to be taken seriously, Caturmukha Krīda and the rest are to be given up and the poet to be denied his very right to express his own outlook. Not only that, the goddess is to be made to react without rhyme or reason. Can such an inconsiderate accusation be accepted?

The sixth fault found with the theme by another critic is this:- "We are, however, not taken into the poet's confidence when, how and why the youthful maiden at Dwaraka gave the ghost to be reborn as Madhuralālasa, the princess."[138]

104 This accusation seems to be inept. Supposing the poet has given some cause for her death which is not in the least a difficult one to invent; in what way will the story be affected, or gain in tempo or richness, or characterisation or *rasa*? It is a well-known general principle followed from time immemorial by all the great artists to omit all the unnecessary details. Only such details as are absolutely required by the story, characterisation, and *rasa* are given. This same principle is clearly and precisely expressed by the greatest Ālankārika, Ānandavardhana, in his Dhvanyālōka.

> కాని పునస్తాని విరోధాని యాని యత్నతః కవేః పరిహర్తవ్యానీ
> త్యుచ్యతే -
> విరోధి రససంబంధి విభావాదిపరిగ్రహః
> విస్తరేణాన్విత స్యాపి వస్తునోన్యస్య వర్ణనమ్.
> అకాండ ఏవ విచ్ఛిత్తి రకాండేచ ప్రకాశనం
> పరిపోషం గతస్యాపి పౌనఃపున్యేన దీపనం
> రసస్య స్యాద్విరోధాయ వృత్త్యనాచిత్య మేవ చ.[139]

Not only that. It is also considered as one of the *rasa doshas* by Mammata. Visvanātha and others. The latter says:-

రసమును తన శబ్దముచేత చెప్పుట, స్థాయి సంచారిణులను సయి
తము స్వశబ్దముచేత చెప్పుట, వైరి రసమునకు అంగ మయిన
విభావాదులను పరిగ్రహించుట, అనుభావ విభావములకు కృచ్ఛ్ర
ముగా ఆక్షేపము చేయుట, అకాండ ప్రథన చ్ఛేదంబులు, మాటి
మాటికిని దీప్తి, అంగిని అనుసంధింపమి, అనంగమును కీర్తించుట,
అంగమునకు అతివిస్తరము, ప్రకృతులకు విపర్యయము, ఇంకను
అర్థానౌచిత్యమును రసగత దోషములుగాఁ జెప్పబడినవి. [140]

The seventh allegation brought against the theme is this:- "How could the relationship of Satvadātman and Madhuralālasa be known to the old Brāhmin, the confidant of Kalāpūrṇa, since even Satvadātman did not know it till Madhuralālasa had told him and the king at the end of the poem." [141]

This seems to be a deviation on the part of the critic. No-where in the text is it given that the old Brāhmin knew the relationship of Satvadātman and Madhuralālasa. It only tells us that Sūgraha is the brother of Rupanubhuti, and that his whereabouts are a mystery. The Brahmin does not identify Satvadātman with Sūgraha, nor is single hint given to that effect. Had the poet written that the old Brahmin knew the relationship between Satvadatman and Madhuralālasa, the present accusation would have been right. But he is too great a poet to commit such a blunder The Brāhmin actually says:-

క. తనమహిమ నాశ్రయక్షితి
యొనరుచుఁ జనఁ జూచి సుగ్రహుకులీనత యం
పు పహారింతు రెఱుఁగుదె
యనుజుడు సు మ్మాతఁ డి మ్మదాశయుసలికి కే.

చ. కడు నుతి కెక్కునట్టి యధికంపుఁ గులీనతచే నతండు న
జ్ఞడల జనాధిపుల్ దనకుఁ గన్యల నిచ్చెద మంచు నెందఱే
బడిబడి జెప్పి పంప నది పాటిగఁ బట్టక వారి యాసుచే
నడపాడలేక పోయెనఁట యల్పములయ్యెఁ గులాభిమానముల్.

క. జనివేళయందు సురభా
గ్యనిమిత్తము లగుచుఁ బెక్కుగ్రహము లునికి నా
తని కిడినాఁరట సుగ్రహుఁ
డను పే రా శాస్త్ర మేమి యయ్యెనొ యెఱుఁగన్.[142]

This statement in no way conflicts either with the curse Sūgraha incurred or with any probability. There is no cause whatsoever for Rūpānubhūti to forget all about her father and brother. Moreover, Sūgraha's name had become proverbial for his pedigree. What really prevented them from recognising Satvadatman as no other person than Sūgraha was the curse inflicted by the *Yati*. Thus there seems to be no error in the theme but only an oversight on the part of the critic.

Before this discussion on the so-called defects in the theme is closed, one more point raised by another critic is to be considered. Though he never mentions it as a fault, it is a grave mistake if it is true. He says by way of mentioning it as a fact that Maṇistambha's peculiar powers of clairvoyance and clairaudience come to a close with the end of the 88th verse of the third canto of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.[143] To put it in plain language, it means that the poet who has created a character with some supernatural powers makes him lose them all on a sudden without providing any cause. If true, it is a case of self-contradiction and inconsistency. Hence it requires careful examination.

To begin with, one has to enquire into the nature and scope of the supernatural powers of Maṇistambha and how he has come to possess them. One of the edicts written on the stone pillar in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana announces that whoever pierces his eye and ear with the style *(gorugallu)* and the arrow respectively will acquire the powers of clairvision and clairaudience.[144] Sumukhāsatti informs Kalabhāṣiṇi that Maṇistambha has acquired these two powers by means of those savage deeds.

But these powers *dūradṛṣṭi* and *dūraśravaṇaśakti* are not to be confused with the divine insight *(divyadṛṣti)* which is commonly mentioned in the puranas and epics.[146] *Divyadṛṣṭi* means the capacity of knowing the past as well as the future. If the poet

had really this in view. he would not have mentioned it as two separate powers; nor would he have prescribed it as two separate powers; nor would he have prescribed two kinds of terrible sacrifices to acquire them. Besides, bifurcation of these powers is all the more necessary for the purport of the poem to be explained later on. So these two powers *dūradrsti* and *dūraśravaṇasakti* are quite different from divyadṛṣti. When etymologically interpreted, the former two mean the capacities or powers of seeing and hearing distant objects of perception. The poet definitely makes his reader understand by distant objects only those of the past and present. Had he meant by these two terms, the capacity to perceive the events of the future also, he would have committed a blunder by unnecessarily bifurcating them and giving them two separate new names instead of calling them by the single well-known term *divyadrsti* Because *duradrsti* and *dūraśravaṇasakti* have this specific connotation, one can understand why Maṇistambha undertook his mission of sacrificing Kalabhāṣiṇi to Mṛgēndravāhana without any thought of its success. If he had the capacity to look into the future, he would not have started on this mission. So his powers have nothing to do with divine insight.

Deviating from the obvious meaning, the critic says that the powers *dūradṛṣti* and *dūraśravanasakti* of Maṇistambha are very limited and that they reveal only those two objects of sight and hearing as they are perceived at the moment but not the changes, and the truth and error.[147] This interpretation is perhaps inadvertant since it is hardly consistent with the powers themselves. Moreover, this interpretation, when logically followed lands one into the theory that perception has nothing to do with truth.[148] This is not only untenable but also unscientific. For example, the case of Maṇistambha may be taken. If he knows all the past history, his past words and deeds of Maṇikandhara, cannot he know the truth about the latter? Scientifically speaking Maṇistambha should have known it. Buit the story tells, that he does not, because he fails to give an account of Maṇikandhara after his first separation from Rambha. This is not the only occa-

sion on which his powers fail. He does not know what has become of Kalabhāṣiṇi after he leaves her in fear of Nalakūbara. How does he not know what has become of Kalabhāṣiṇi after he leaves her in fear of Nalakūbara?

This failure, as it appears, is not due to the limitation of the powers. They are not properly utilised by the agent. Had Maṇistambha used them in a cool and collected manner, he would have arrived at the truth and the peculiar changes in the situation.[149] But such peace and calm in the exercise of his powers are completely denied to him except on one occasion when he is able to locate Kalabhāṣiṇi as a victim of sacrifice to Mṛgēndravāhana. He is able also to give correctly the past history of Nārada and Maṇikandhara and thus gain the confidence of Kalabhāṣiṇi. Later on his failure to know the activities of Maṇistambha after his first separation from Rambha is due to his disinclination to exercise his powers but not to his incapacity

108

to know the truth.[150] Since his last revelation to Kalabhāṣiṇi, more than an hour and a half should have elapsed because he himself tells her that it takes an hour and thirty six minutes to reach the forest in which Maṇikandhara has performed penance [151] During this interval the latter has assumed the form of Nalakūbara. There is no wonder in *siddha* not knowing this later development. Except on the last occasion, Maṇistambha has neither peace of mind nor leisure to exercise his powers.

So the critic's explanation does not seem to be plausible. The exact words *dūradṛṣṭi* and *dūraśravanasakti* hardly support him in his interpretation. The other statment that Maṇistambha's powers come to a close with the 88th verse of the third canto does not conform to the textual evidence. When Nalakūbara and Māya Nalakūbara have fought for a sufficiently long time, Rambha conceives and idea by which she can recognise the real Nalakūbara.[152] She parts them; and taking one after the other aside, puts in secret a question to which one gves a correct reply and the other does not. Maṇistambha cannot be said to be so near to Rambha as to overhear that secret question. If that is true, how does Maṇistambha come to know this particular

question? From this it is clearly evident that he has utilised his power of *dūraśravaṇa* and has come to know that Rambha has asked them when the reference to Kalūpūrṇa was made. Now some doubt may arise as to why Maṇistambha does not mention the answers given by Nalakūbaras if he really knows them. These answers are not required either for the reders, or by any internal necessity.

In this connection, there is one point which appears to be missed generally. The manner in which Sumukhasatti recognises Maṇistambha as her husband is rather strange and bewildering. The poet here seems to be playing with - or can it be said ridiculing - the memory of his readers. How can Maṇistambha endowed with the two supernatural powers of clairaudience and clairvision be expected not to know the cause of dispute between Salina and Sugātri? Sumukhasatti also knows quite well that he has these two supernatural powers. Is she not the very first person to inform Kalabhāṣiṇi of this fact? Knowing all this as she does, how is she convinced that Maṇistambha is her husband? If he has given the real cause for the dispute, it may be due to his supernatural powers. On what grounds is Sumukhāsatti able to ascertain for herself that this is not the case? One is not enlightened on this point.

But the poet is quite aware of what he is doing. Otherwise he will not follow the technique of politicians who side-track the attention of their nations to other issues when their policies fail. When Sumukhasatti tells Maṇikaṅdhara that she is Sugātri, Maṇistambha also comes out with his story and tells them that he is Salina. Then the question of establishing their identity arises. She promises first to tell and then to write and thus let Kalabhāṣiṇi know the cause of their dispute. Immediately she becomes aware of Maṇistambha's supernatural powers, and requests Maṇikaṅdhara to get the explanation first from Maṇistambha and then from her. Because the causes mentioned by both of them agree, they are identified as Sugatri and Sālīna. The whole thing is so picturesquely painted that the readers are put off their guard. If the poet were not personally aware of the

weakness, he would not have put up such a pretty long show. The very fact that this present point has escaped notice shows clearly that he has succeeded in his efforts. Really, readers have to thank the poet and laugh at themselves for being taken in so easily. The poet is not altogether without another clue to their identity, but he does not openly use it because probably he is bent upon playing with the memory of the readers. Since it is going to be discussed in some other connection, it need not be pursued here.

Now to summarise. Except for the defects shown in the later part of the poem commencing from the 192nd verse of the 6th Canto, the rest of the alleged faults seem to have sprung from indolence rather than from reason. Even those adverse remarks passed against the later part of the poem can be explained away to some extent as attempted in this chapter. However, this makes the events criticised only probable but does not show their necessity and thereby take the wind out of the arguments of Dr.CR. Reddy. Regarding characterisation, there are practically no flaws found by the critics except in the case of Nārada and Madhuralālasa. Those who have remarked that Nārada's conflict with Tumburu and his learning music in the harem of Krsna is silly[153] seem to have not taken into account the principles of psychology and the existence of such an episode in the Lingapurana. The characterisation of Madhuralālasa is severely criticised by Dr. Reddy; but he does not show any inherent flaws of inconsistency, rigidity and lifelessness. So one may beg to differ with him on this issue.

CHAPTER VI

POSITIVE MERITS OF THE KALĀPŪRṆŌDAYAM

Sūrana's greatness as a poet in general, and the uniqueness of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam in particular, lie firstly in delineation of characters, secondly, in the background provided for the various episodes and persons, thirdly, in making the names integral parts of the story, fourthly, in the structure of the incidents and episodes and lastly, in the significant technique adopted in presentation. Of course this list does not include the beauties of style, wordnusic, and description, and the profoundity of the theme. Since these aspects are not immediately concerned with the subject, the delineation of characters can be directly taken up for discussion.

Generally speaking, Sūrana belongs more to that class of poets who dive deep into experience to sound the depths of the human heart than to those who soar high on the wings of luring idealism and fantastic imagination. Hence he must be more realistic than romantic and more dramatic than narrative. These qualities in turn must necessarily determine and bestow on the work other qualities if it is really to be *sui generis*. Characters, whatever supernatural powers or abnormal traits they may have, must be definite, concrete and human through and through. The story therefore must be sufficiently broad and deep for the characters to have full play. A poet who prescribes for himself these rules cannot escape from being a humanist. That means the characters he introduces, whether they are Gods, or risis, or demons, must be presented purely from the point of view of man. This in its own turn leads to realistic style and natural expression keeping wordmusic, bewitching phrase, mesmerising exaggeration and awe-inspiring idealisation in abeyance. These are the general tendencies to be met with in Sūrana's characters. If

it is not a repetition, one may say that his characters are intended more for one's understanding and appreciation than for one's identification with them and imitation.

NĀRADA

These remarks can be fully grasped when the major characters of the story are examined. The examination may begin with Nārada, the *sūtradhāra* or director of the whole play. Tradition says that he is a *maharṣi* well accomplished in music as well as in bringing about conflicts and fights between two parties. He is capable of cursing those with whom he is displeased, and blessing those with whom he is immensely pleased. With these qualities and halos about him, he appears to belong to the world of the change less, the eternal and the absolute rather than to the world of human beings. The poet brings him down to this world of change and motion, and makes him move among the creatures of flesh and blood without depriving him of his divinity. Nevertheless, nothing appears unnatural and incongruent. On the other hand, he becomes more human and more lovable.

When Nārada is approaching Dvāraka from the aerial path with his disciple Maṇikaṇdhara, the latter is attracted by the beauty of Kalabhāsini and her friends swinging in cradles of flowery twigs, and bursts into poetic expression. He knows quite well his disciple's unconscious love, and instead of checking it with his strong grunt and reproof, encourages him by his approval. At the same time he takes every care not to let his disciple understand his intention. This approval of the statement of Maṇikaṇdhara by Nārada wounds Rambha's pride in her beauty. Knowing that it is the opinion of Nārada, the great seer, she is neither able to accept it in silence, nor burst into a passion. Along with her lover she pays homage to the seer when he blesses them with ever-increasing mutual love. She takes that opportunity to express her real heart in a subtle manner. The great seer is neither insensitive to nor tolerant of such vanity and petulance. If it had been *Durvasa* or some other *maharṣi*, he would have flown into anger and boisterously cursed them. Nārada's tem-

perament is quite different, and he speaks just like a cultured man without appearing offended in the least. For all practical purposes his reply appears to be pure and simple, but in reality it is a terrible curse inflicted on the divine coulple. The seer does not leave the events to take their own course. When he meets Kalabhāṣiṇi, he understands her ins and outs and sympathises with her ambitions instead of hating her caste and the wrong course her love takes. He wants to use her as a medium for the materialisation of his curse on Rambha and Nalakūbara. What is more interesting in this situation is that Kalabhāṣiṇi thinks all the while that she is achieving her ends with the help of Narada, and Nārada knows not only her mind but also his personal intention He accepts her as his disciple to carry the *vīna* into the harem of Kṛṣna and does everything to encourage love between Manikandhara and Kalabhāsini in such a way that the latter is unaware of it.

Another interesting thing is that, in spite of his proficiency in music, Nārada is said to have been visiting Kṛṣṇa only to improve his knowledge of this art. This point has created antipathy in more than one critic. They seem to reckon without their host because music is one of the fine arts whose scope is infinite, and however well-accomplished one may be, there still remains something more to learn and master. If this is conceded, there is nothing silly or absurd in Nārada learning it from Kṛṣṇa who is an incarnation of the Lord Viṣṇu. After he finished his education in music, he expressed his doubt to his disciples about his proficiency in spite of the unreserved compliments of Kṛṣṇa and his wives. Is it worthy of a *maharsi* to doubt the very *gurus* who taught him music? Cannot he know whether the compliments are meant to be sincere or only to please him? Having *divyadrsti,* he cannot be said to have really doubted them. His main purpose is to humour Kalabhāṣiṇi's ambition, and thus create conditions for the fulfilment of his curse upon Rambha. The irony of the situation is she does not know her *gurū's* motive, but only gloats over the boon she gets from him to achieve her ends.

G V. Krishna Rao

Rewarding Kalabhāṣiṇi for her sincere service, he sends her away and then gives proper advice to Maṇikaṇdhara as to how he should make use of his poetic faculty and musical talent in the service of the Lord Viṣṇu. He tells him pointedly that there is no easier path than music to enter into the grace of the Almighty. He illustrates this point from his personal history, his conflict with Tumburu, his jealousy of his rival, his long penance and final achievement after a laborious struggle. This episode reveals the human heart at its very root. Even *maharṣis* and devas are no exceptions to these jealousies and passions. They may not react so vulgarly as common folk do, but all the same they too are victims in their own way. Then Maṇikaṇdhara bids his *guru* adieu and cuts his lonely furrow.

After more than one and a half years Nārada once again meets his disciples involved in a very interesting situation. This really provides one with an opportunity to understand the great soul in its true colours. Since his curse materialises and Rambha reaps the fruit of her insolence, Nārada dances with joy. But there are two more questions to be taken into consideration. His very disciples are involved in such a dangerous situation as would spell utter ruin of their present lives. On the other hand, the real Nalakūbara is made to bear undue punishment for no fault of his. Added to this, ethical decency is thrown to the winds. How is one to understand Nāradā's bursting into laughter over this incident? Has he no compassion for his disciples, nor respect for ethics?

He is not so simple and insensitive a being as he appears to be. Rambha deserves her punishment, and so he does not hesitate to ridicule her even in her pitiable condition. He taunts her with this remark addressed to Māya Nalabkūbara:-

తనకంటెం బ్రియ నీకు లేదు తన సౌందర్యంబె సౌందర్య మం
చును గర్వించుచు నున్న రంభ మదముం జూడంగ లే కిట్టిదా
సిని నీవే సృజియించితో యదియు తా నీతోడఁ గ్రీడింపఁగాఁ
దనమె నొక్కటి చాలదంచుఁ గడకా వైరూప్యముందాల్చెనో. [154]

Though he has affection for his two disciples, he does not try to save them nor reprove them for their improper behaviour simply because he knows beyond doubt that both of them have to incur curses in order to have a more glorious future. When this toleration is mistaken for approval, and when he is requested to help in detecting the real Rambha, Nārada gives a serious but suggestive rebuff to Māyā Nalakūbara:-

క   ...తథ్య మిథ్యా
భావంబుల కేమి నీకు భావింపఁగ స్వా
భావికమే యీ యాకృతి
భావము నిజ మెద్ది యీ ప్రపంచమునందున్[155]

This for Māyā Nalakūbara means: "Why do you talk of reality and unreality, when you yourself assume such a false form? You fool, don't talk of it any more." And for the other two it means: "Why do you raise the question of reality and unreality? Do you think that this form is natural? Nothing is real in this world."

When Māyā Nalakūbara receives this reply, he shakes in his shoes and sends him off as soon as possible. Warning him not to overstep the limits, Nārada leaves the scene only to approach the real Nalakūbara and inform him of Māya Nalakūbara's love affairs with his beloved and to send him immediately to that spot. Why does he take so much trouble? Is it out of a perverted nature of rejoicing over others' quarrels and feuds? If that is the reason, why does he not appear on the scene as on the previous occasion? So this attribute "జగడపుఁ గూటి సత్తరువు సారెకుఁ గోరుచు వారిపేరిటం దగిలెడు తందనాల జడదారి" is not to be taken too literally. He wants justice prevail on the one hand, and does not like his pupils to come to grief before his very eyes on the other. Moreover, Rambha has received sufficient retribution for her insolence. There will be no more sense in allowing the scene of sin to continue. Nārada, therefore, sends Nalakūbara to the spot to put an end to it.

Such is the character of Nārada as he appears in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. In spite of his divine qualities, he is human through and through. Though his supernatural powers prevent

the readers from completely identifying themselves with him, they feel him to be one moving amidst them, understand his jealousy, crave for his affection, fear his anger and applaud his righteousness.

MANIKANDHARA

Maṇikandhara, the hero of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is a *gandharva* by birth and a lover of beauty by temperament. When he hears the poems in praise of the Lord Anantapadmanābha, his heart throbs with so great a joy that he wants to acquire that inimitable faculty. Goaded by this inner urge, he goes to the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana, and cutting off his tongue with a sword as prescribed by the rites mentioned in the inscription on the pillar, he acquires the poetic faculty.[156] He exhibits this divine gift in praising the Lord and receives the blessing of the devotees. Mere acquisition of this poetic gift does not satisfy him; his vanity or one may call it his poetic sincerity, compels him to get it tested by the famous *ālamkārikās* of Kāshmir. But this object has to be postponed *sine die* due to the tragic disapearance of Sugātri and Sālīna.

With lapse of time Maṇikandhara develops a taste for music which makes him the disciple of Nārada. Daily he accompanies his *guru* to the court of Krsna where he happens to meet Kalabhāṣiṇi for the first time. It may be presumed that Kalabhāṣiṇi's wonderful talent of recapitulation of the poem *(dandaka)* composed on Krsna by Maṇikandhara has drawn his attention and appreciation though the poet does not say so explicitly. After a few days, while he is on his aerial path to *Dvāraka*, he is attracted by the beauty of Kalabhāṣiṇi swinging along with her mates in the flowery twigs and bursts out-

తమిఁ బూఁదీఁగెలఁ దూఁగుటుయ్యెలలఁ బంతాలాడుచుం దూఁగు నా
కొమరుంబ్రాయపు గబ్బిగుబ్బెతల యంఘ్రుల్ చక్కఁగాఁ జాఁగి మిం
చి మొగంబై చనుదెంచు రీవి గనుఁగొంటే దివ్యమాసీంద్ర నా
క మృగనేత్రలమీఁదఁగ య్యములకుం గా ల్బ్యాఁచులా గొప్పెడున్[157]

This unconsious love of Maṇikandhara for Kalabhāṣiṇi is approved by Nārada. Later on, as Kalabhāṣiṇi becomes the disciple of Nārada, both the hero and the heroine come into closer contact. But this intimacy never precipitates itself into open love due to their great respect and fear for their *guru*. Thus this love of Maṇikandhara remains altogether suppressed.

After Nārada and Maṇikandhara have achieved their object of learning music, the former advises the latter before his final departure to dedicate his tow great faculties to Lord Viṣṇu and lead a life of piety and pilgrimage. The hero, being virtuous by temperament, follows the instructions of his guru to the letter, and at last takes to penance in a forest to the west of Anantaśayana. The inherent weakness of his artistic temperament makes him a victim to the allurements of Rambha's beauty and when he comes to know her love for Nalakūbara from her own lips he feels hurt. But his affection for Rambha does not lelave him in rest until he assumes the form of Nalakūbara and gets united with her.

The most interesting and character - revealing episode in the life of Maṇikandhara is that of Rambha and Māyā Rambha each claiming his love Though he perfectly knows that Rambha loves only Nalakūbara and that she has spent some time with him only to achieve the object of Indra, he does not hesitate to assume the form of Nalakūbara. In his passionate craving for her he loses all self-control and oversteps the bounds of decency. Chance or destiny, as it may be called, ensnares him in his own meshes when Kalabhāsiṇi enjoys his company in the form of Rambha. Circumstances do not leave him there in the net of lust and deceit of his own creation. They bring the real Rambha into the picture so as to reveal the horror of his action in retrospection. When he sees the two Rambhas quarrelling before his very eyes he is baffled. He seeks the help of Nārada who has come to riducule Rambha and enjoy the funny situation, and receives only rebuff and a hint that one of the two is Kalabhāṣiṇi. Now the important question is whether Maṇikandhara has grasped Nāradā's suggestion and understood that one of the two is

Kalabhāṣiṇi his co-disciple. Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyaṇa Sāstri positively asserts that he does[158] and this is not altogether without reason. When Nārada curses Rambha [159] and blesses Kalabhāṣiṇi with a boon,[160] Maṇikandhara is present. Hence there is ground for the readers to believe that though Maṇikandhara is not able to recognise the real Rambha, he should have known that one of the two is Kalabhāṣiṇi. If this interpretation is valid, his character is certainly not pure and praiseworthy. Judged from this angle, he appears to be selfish through and through without the least trace of sympathy even for a co-disciple with whom he has moved and whose friendship he has cultivated for more than four years. Even after he has known that Kalabhāsiṇi is involved in the ugly situation, he does not try to prevent their quarrel. At least he should have prevented Rambha from inflicting a curse on Kalabhāṣiṇi who has been loving him sincerely. On the contrary, he not only approves of the curse of Rambha but also insults Kalabhāsini by demanding from her her name. [161]

Commenting on and at the same time supporting the strange behaviour of Maṇikandhara, Mr. Sūryanārāyana Sāstri says:- "By the words of Nārada, Māyā Nalakūbara certainly knows that Māyā Rambha is Kalabhāṣiṇi. Even then, what does it matter? This is not the timẹ to take freindship into consideration. Kalabhāṣiṇi can never guess that it was Maṇikandara that necked her out. She has never come there because of her love towards Maṇikandhara. He has not enjoyed with her under the impression that she has been Kalabhāṣiṇi. Though the story tells us that they both meet once again, they, in their present circumstances, cannot anticipate further meeting. Nor is there any scope for either of them to think that they would become husband and wife in their next births. Apart from these considerations the real Rambha has undergone much trouble and agony. If he does not neck her out who has been the cause of her grief how can Rambha be relieved of her grief? How can she believe him to be the real Nalakūbara? How can he who is still craving for Rambha restrain himself from punishing the Māyā Rambha who has with-

out any justification inflicted so much pain? Though he knows Māyā Rambha to be Kalabhāṣiṇi how can he avoid pretending not to know her? Can he burst into sympathy saying " Oh! poor creature why have you come and fall him into the snare?" If he utters this the whole aesthetic effect will be shattered to pieces. The curse which is later on to be inflicted by Nalakūbara or some other punishment greater than this would have been hurled at by Rambha there by damaging the structure of the story beyond repair".[162]

This comment is scholarly but unfortunately does not seem to throw light on the matter. One does not question the probability of Maṇikandara behaving as he does towards Māyā Rambha even after an intimate friendship of four years. What concerns us here most is this if it is maintained that Manikhandara have behaved in that manner knowing Māyā Rambha to be Kalabhāṣiṇi, can it explain his later behaviour without any inconsistency? This is not a question of ethics, but of aesthetics.

'If the commentator is right, i.e. if Maṇikandhara is to be understood as having behaved in that manner knowing quite well that Māyā, Rambha is Kalabhāṣiṇi, he is selfish to the core. Neither friendship nor comparision for the unfortunate, nor love for truth, weighs with him where self interest is involved. These qualities are utterly absent in his later behaviour. On the contrary the oppossite traits are met with. When he meets Kalabhāṣiṇi in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana after long seperation he betrays not merely simple warmth but also great emotion. He puts a volley of questions which shows his attachment to and deep love for Kalabhāṣiṇi. Even a horrible person like Maṇistambha who tried not only to sacrifice Kalabhāṣiṇi to Mṛgēndravāhana but also to rape her, his shown some leniency and consideration. If these actions are meant only to please others and to keep up decency and civility what necessity is there for Maṇikandhara to reveal himself as the person who has enjoyed the love of Kalabhāṣiṇi? It cannot be argued that he feared a curse from her because he had already received one from Nalakūbara. Moreover, if his sympathy and love for Kalabhāṣiṇi are only a pretention

he would not have taken so much pains as to narrates the story of Sugathri and Salina in order to assure her of his belief in her words. Even supposing that all these arguments are not sufficiently strong why does Manikandhara hesitate and even make delay in sacrificing Kalabhāṣini to Mṛgēndravāhana? By that sacrifice he would enjoy a vast empire unhampered. That hesitation and delay cannot be a mere make belief, becuase the goddess Mṛgendravahana herself certifies it and even says that he would become that an emperor only in his next birth, because of his hesitation and delay. Added to these, there are two more incidents which reveal his true character. Of these two, the first is his requst to Svabhava to show him the means by which he would not fall a prey to weaknesses and sins that genarally follow in the wake of wealth and power.[163] The second incident is that in which he willingly meets his death to save Abhinavakaumudi from Salyāsura.

Hence it does not consistent with the later events to maintain that manikandhara knows Māyā Rambha to be Kalabhasini and consciously behaves in that unconscientious manner. Now another question may araise in this context. Even supposing that Maṇikandhara does not know that Mayā Rambha is Kalabhāsini and hence he has behaved so callously does it positively show that his character is not unimpeachable? How can anyone defend Manikandhara when he assumes the form of Nalakūbara and deceives Rambha? Can he be considered to be compassionate when he humiliates a poor creature like Kalabhāsini who has been sufficiently punished for her sin?.

Before these questions are answered it is necessary to recapitulate the whole situation. At the behest of Indra, Rambha has managed to spoil his penance and draw him into the ecstasies of love. Very soon to his great grief he fiends that her heart completely belongs to Nalakūbara Had he wished he could have continued his dalliance with her in his own form. But his desire to please her and thus take possession of her whole heart encourages him to assume the form of Nalakūbara. Now at this juncture comes in Māyā Rambha. He does not who she is, nor is

he able to find any justification for her to appear on the scene This strange position gives him complete freedom of conscience and action.Hence he remains as a simple spectator to their quarrel and even complains about it to Nārada, when his guru gives him a rebuff he become alert and sends him away. When the real Rambha inflicts a curse on impostress he not only feels relieved of his anxiety but also thinks that simple justice has previled. Had he stopped there would have been no complaint. But driven by curiosity he oversteps the limits of decency when he demands from Māyā Rambha her real name. For this one weakness the poet puts forward a justification saying :-

నలకూబరుండును దత్కాలగుణం బెట్టిదియో కాని యౌగాములు

వివేకింప లేక యిది యిట్టి శాపంబునకుఁ దగు నని పలికి యోసి

నీ పే రెట్టిది యెట్టిదాన వని యడిగె......[164]

121

Thus this interpretation that Maṇikandhara does not know the impostress to be Kalabhāṣiṇi is quite consistent with his later behaviour. But all the same there are two more things to be cleared. Firstly, how has he, who was present when Rambha was cursed and Kalabhāsiṇi blessed, failed to grasp the suggetion of Nārada that one of the two Rambhas is Kalabhāṣiṇi? Secondly, why does he refer to Kalabhāsiṇi secret desire when he meets her in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana if he does not know her to be impostrss? If these questions cannot be answered, the commentator's explanation is to be accepted. If this explanation is accepted, the inconsistency in the character of Maṇikandhara also has to be admitted.

To avoid the two horns of this dilemma one has to find answers to the two questions. It is true that Nārada gives a clue to find out that one of the two Rambhas is Kalabhāṣiṇi. But Maṇikandhara who is too much enamoured of Rambha is more anxious to identify her and dally with her than to know who the impostress is. That is exactly the reason why he requests Nārada once again :-

క. నా విని యిప్పు డీ భావం
బీవనితకు నీవనితకు నిది యనుచు బయ
ల్గావించి తథ్య మిథ్యా
భావంబులు మీర తేరుపఱుపఁగ వలయున్.[165]

Had he really grasped the implications of Nārada's suggestion as to the identity of Kalabhaṣini, he should certainly have been taken by surprise. But, such a reaction on his part is completely absent. On the other hand he requests Nārada to point out the real Rambha from the unreal. Even this deliberate suppression of one's own feelings is possible only in consummate villains. But the story as it goes no where hints at this possibility. Hence it can be positively said that Maṇikandhara has not grasped Nārada's suggetion immediately. He has practically no time left to think over matters because event after event follows in such rapid succession that he cannot even breathe. He finds time only after he receives a curse from Nalakūbara. That tragic event makes him review the immediate past - the quarrel of Rambhas, the words of Nārada, the curse inflicted on the impostress and finally his fate. At this juncture, the thought that the impostress is Kalabhāsiṇi dawns on his mind. He is so much taken aback by this thought that he is not able to believe it completely. His *guru* Nārada is a great seer, and so, he cannot be expected to give false information. It is true that Kalabhāṣiṇi had acquired the power to change her form. But how did she manage to know that Rambha was spending her time with him, and that it was the most opportune moment for her to meet Nalakūbara? Even granting that she knew it somehow, how could she come all the way from Dvāraka to the first lying far far away from her native city? Due to these considerations he is neither able to believe Nāradā's words, nor completely ignore them. When he meets Kalabhàsini in the temple of Mrgēndravāhana, he refers to her secret desire in his conversation more to allay his doubt than to taunt her for her infidelity.

This explanation seems to be more plausible. Anyhow it is for the judicious readers to decide. There is perhaps nothing more to comment upon the character of Manikandhara than what has been said in other contexts.

KALABHASINI

The character of Kalabhāsini is profoundly conceived and beautifully presented. It stands unique in Telugu literature and demands a high place among the characters presented by Sanskrit drama. Vasantasēna, the heroine of the Mrcchakatika, appears to be rigid and affected when compared with Kalabhasini. Given the shortcomings and infidelity of Kalabhāṣini, no other poet could have produced in the readers so much sympathy and understanding. What is more astounding is that no other poet of those times, when chastity was considered as the highest virtue to womanhood, would have dared to accept her as the heroine of his work and at the same time could have dreamt of making her a success. How does Sūrana achieve this almost impossible task? The answer lies in the critical analysis of this character of Kalabhasini.

She is a beautiful maiden belonging to the courtezan class and well accomplished in fine arts. As a regular visitor to the court of Krsna, she comes across Manikandhara, the disciple of Nārada. His poetic faculty draws her affection and friendship. But she suppresses these tender feelings because of the gulf between their respective classes and her fear of Nārada. One day it so happens that she perceives Nalakūbara and Rambha, and overhears their conversation with Nārada The beauty of Nalakūbara and Nārada's curse on Rambha, stir her suppressed love to throb with a new life. She wants to get her desire fulfilled with the help of that great seer. She prostrates herself before him and offers her services as a disciple to carry his *vina* into the harem of Krsna. Though she takes every care to conceal her real intention, Nārada understands everything and accepts her as his disciple for his own ends. Four years of devoted service to Nārada bestow on her a gift of unsurpassed music and at the same time

earn for her the goodwill of Narada and the deep friendship of Manikandhara. Before his final departure the seer out of sympathy for her and determination to bring about the fulfilment of his curse, expressses his apparent desire to know the real opinion of the wives of Krsna regarding his proficiency in music. Grasping this opportunity, she tells him that she can find it out provided she has the power to assume the form of any woman she likes. Nārada readily grants this power knowing full well the consequences. Kalabhāsini performs what is exactly wanted of her with the result her guru gives her his blessing:-

> కొమ్మ మున్ను నీ వాత్మలోఁ గోరినట్టి
> కాంతు రంభామనోహరాకారుఁ డగుచు
> మెఱయువానిని గూడి రమింపఁ గలవు.

After parting from her *guru* and Manikandhara, she sits at home with an aching heart for her lover. However hard she may think, she finds no way to achieve her much-cherished goal. Thus more than a year and a half passes in complete agony, whereupon Manistambha appears on the scene as if he were the saviour. With the supernatural powers of clairvoyance and clairaudience, he gives a full account of Manikandhara, his pilgrimage, penance and union with Rambha. In spite of her caution, tact and sagacity, she becomes a victim of Manistambha. The evidence given by the parrot and the elaborate description of holy places of pilgrimage suggesting Manistambha's devotion to God and his religious bent of mind inflame her strong and secret passion. Throwing away her caution, she explains to him her love for Nalakūbara and begs him to take her on his lion to her lover.

While she is on her way, her suspicions are roused by the information that the Rambha is not with Manikandhara at that juncture. Her heart sinks within her, but soon she realises that no amount of despair and lamentation will save her. With a throbbing heart she proceeds only to be left in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana where she comes to know the real intention of the *Siddha* from Sumukhasatti. She swoons, recovers, wails and

ultimately begs Sumukhāsatti to come to her rescue. When Maṇistambha raises his sword to cut off her head, Sumukhāsatti forbids him to kill her in the name of the goddess. Unheeding the old woman's pleading, Maṇisatmbha proceeds in his evil design only to be thrown far away along with the heroine on to a flowery bed in the neighbourhood of Maṇikandhara's hermitage. Even this supernatural intervention does not put an end to her troubles. Attracted by her unsurpassed beauty in her state of terrible fear, he tries to violate her chastity when she shrieks aloud for rescue. No sooner does she wail for help than comes the assurance of help from Nalakūbara. The *Siddha* runs for his life pursued by Nalakūbara. Utilising the boon bestowed on her by her *guru*, Kalabhāṣiṇi meets Māyā Nalakūbara in the form of Rambha and manages to release *Siddha* Now these are the most blissful moments never to be had once again in her present life.

Soon the real Rambha appears on the scene with the result a quarrel ensues between them. It is of immense beauty, unique in Telugu literature and unsurpassed by any other thing in Sanskrit. True to life, it presents a comedy of immense beauty. The charges and counter-charges, denunciations and condemnations, and proofs and counter-proofs that are exchanged between Rambha and the impostress astound the readers. This episode is really a testimony to Kalabhāṣiṇi's intelligence, courage, presence of mind and tact. In spite of all these qualities, her fraud is detected, and the curse that she will fall by a sword is pronounced on her.

Her short-lived romance thus ending in tragedy, Kalabhāṣhiṇi with a stout heart reconciles herself to her fate and returns to the temple to die peacefully before the altar so that the *siddha* may have his wish fulfilled. How many people can do what she does? What amount of calmness and determination is needed to do it! Another characteristic trait of hers is revealed by another event. The *siddha* who has been a spectator to this astounding comedy narrates the whole episode, and then asks for her story subsequent to his flight. There is no necessity for her to

tell him the truth for it will only betray the looseness of her character. Nor is there anybody who has seen it or can guess it. Nārada is the only person to know it definitely and he cannot be expected to reveal it. As regards Maṇikandhara, he is still in doubt as explained already.

Nevertheless she comes out with the truth that she was the Māyā Rambha. Why does she reveal it to those who do not know it and thus condemn herself to shame? She does so either because she is too good to hide the truth, or because some sole aim of her life should have been so much thwarted that she loses her balance and bursts into grief. The first cannot be the reason for her self-exposure, for she has not revealed her real intention even to Nārada her *guru,* or to the *siddha* at the outset. So the latter must be the cause of her despair. Now what is that aim which she values so much? She has loved Nalakūbara and has undergone all this trouble only to get united with somebody whom she does not know This wounds her feelings beyond description. Life for her seems not worth living: The determination to sacrifice herself to the goddess so that the *siddha* may acquire a great empire takes possession of her. Hence she reveals herself to be the impostress and expresses her great grief over her union with an unknown person This purity of heart and sincerity of her love are at once reciprocated by Maṇikandhara s admission that he is the person who has violated her chastity. This information taken together with the recollection of the parting words of the great seer, enables her to psycho-analyse her whole love affair before her auditors, Maṇistambha, sumukhasatti and Maṇikandra When she came across the latter, she fell head-long in love with him. But her fear of Nārada that he might take serious objection to it, has played havoc with her love and has caused the whole tragedy. This unconscious fear shows her the partial similarity in the names of Maṇikandhara and Maṇigrīva, brings for her into limelight the terrible curse inflicted by Nārada on the latter and his brother, and thus checks the natural course open to her love She sees in Nalakūbara some faint resemblance to Maṇikandhara and naturally comes to think that the latter is the real object of

her love. Thus her deep and sincere love ends in a tragedy of sublimation, simple and pure. She knows quite well that her explanation will not easily convince others, and she says in *de profundis*:-

క. ఆ యక్షతనయుఁ డని ని
స్నే యేఁ బొందితిఁ దుద న్వినిర్మలభాగ్య
శ్రీ యే మని చెప్పుదుఁ బడ
బోయినఁ బూఁబాన్పునఁ బడు పోలిక యయ్యెన్.

ఉ. శ్రీయుతమైన దివ్యమణి చేతికి నబ్బఁగఁ బారవైచిత
చ్ఛాయ యొకింత యున్కిఁ గని చాలఁ గ్రహించితి గాజుపూసనై
నా యవివేక మే మనుకొనందుదఁ దన్మణి యబ్బె నన్న న
త్యాయత తత్సమాగమ సుఖాప్తికి నోఁచమి నెంచి కుందెదన్.

ఆ. ఇట్టిమాట లిప్పుడే నాడుకొనుటయు
ననుచితంబు వారవనిత పలుకు
లిచ్చకంబు లనక యెవ్వరు నమ్మెద
రదియుఁ గాక దృష్ట మన్యవాంఛ. [166]

Sincere and true, this explanation moves Maṇikandhara to tears. He assures her of the truth and relieves her grief by pointing to the parting words of Nārada and substantiating her explanation by the illustration of the story of Sugātri and Sālīna.

One interesting point in this context is that this psychic process is not generally appreciated. Mr. Mallādi Sūryanārāyana Sāstri does not believe it to be true and comments that kalabhāṣini speaks cleverly rather than the truth itself [167] Dr. C. R. Reddy, [168] on the other hand, thinks that Kalabhāṣiṇi has loved equally both Maṇikandhara and Nalakūbara, and raises the question whether it is possible for one to love two persons at one and the same time. He says that is is possible and cites an example. But both these views appear unconvincing. From the beginning to the end Kalabhāṣiṇi has loved only one person and that is Maṇikandhara. This sincere love suppressed by the fear of Nārada and misdirected by the faint resemblance in form between Maṇikandara and Nalakūbara has sublimated her craving for the

latter. To deny this is to deny the laws of association enunciated long ago[169] by Vātsyāyana, the great commentator of the Nyāya Sutras, and established beyond doubt by Freud and his school. Not only that. To misunderstand this is to misunderstand the characters of Maṇikandhara, Maṇistambha and Sumukhasatti. Especially a great and firm character like Sumukhasatti cannot be expected to agree to have Kalabhasini as her daughter-in-law if the latter is as loose in her morals as these critics suppose her to be. Nor is Manikandhara a social reformer of the modern age to accept her as his wife in his next birth. Above all, this tragic event loses all its point and intensity if Kalabhaṣiṇi's account is not taken to be true. Hence it is apparently difficult to accept the explanation offered by Mr. Sāstri and Dr. Reddy.

Now to resume, Kalabhāsini s greatness reveals itself in facing death coolly and calmly at the hands of Maṇikandhara. In her next birth she is born as Madhuralālasa in a royal family. From her very childhood she develops a deep and devoted love for her would-be-husband. There is nothing more to say than that she has achieved the ideal of Indian womanhood by being faithful to her husband Kalapurna both in thought and action.

SUGATRI

If the character of kalabhāṣiṇi is the result of profound conception, the character of Sugatri is the culmination of delicate handling. What Kālidāsa has achieved in his Pārvati in the realm of romantic idealism, Pingali Sūrana has achieved in Sugatri in the realm of naked realism. Had this character been handled by any other poet than Sūrana, it would have been not only insipid but also vulgar beyound description. How the poet has achieved this marvellous beauty is to be examined.

Though Sugātri is the only daughter of her parents, she has never become the victim of indolence. Intelligent, sensitive and cultured that she has become, she is married to a bashful youth called Salina who is required to stay for ever in his mother-in-law's house. And there is no other man to look after the affais of that family. By temperament Sugatri's mother is self-assertive

and proud of her riches. Her only ambition still unrealised is to have a grandson and dote over him. But this is for all practical purposes upset due to strange circumstances. On the first night of their prescribed union, Sugātri is sent to her husband gorgeously decorated and fully ornamented but he retires within himself without having even a glance at her. This odd behaviour, on the next morning, becomes the general talk among Sugātri's mates. The mother-in-law reproaches them for indulging in such silly talk and sends her daugther to her husband next night also only to be treated as on the previous night. This state of affairs continuing without any end in view, she gets completely disappointed and disgusted with her son-in-law.

Sugātri, who should have been really more aggrieved than her mother, reacts altogether in a different manner. Instead of feeling insulted or repulsed, she becomes all the more attached to her husband as it is the way of a Hindu wife. Her devotion to her husband whose likes and dislikes, whims and fancies, temperament and character she does not know, clearly shows beyond doubt that she has acquired some *yōgic* tendencies of her father. Otherwise she could not have concentrated her complete love on her husband and made him the guiding star of her life. This great power of concentration makes her reconcile herself to the situation. Nevertheless she has to face another problem equally acute if not more. Her mother, who has developed a disregard and even antipathy to Salina whom she considers to be quite impotent as well as useless, begins to find fault with him indirectly in the earlier stages and later on censures him directly. This antipathy of hers finally leads her to treat him as no better than a household servant and a gardener. This is really a crucial test of Sugatri's affection for her mother, love for her husband and consideration for the family prestige. Torn between these three loyalties. she does not despair, lose her balance and self-possession. She reacts promptly, correctly and vigorously. She faces her mother boldly when her husband is absent, and firmly admonishes her for her attitude towards her son-in-law in such a manner that neither the neighbours nor her husband come to

know of it. In spite of this remonstrance, she is not able to prevent her mother from sending her husband off to the garden. She should have gone over to her husband and have lived with him there; but her shyness - the shyness of a recently married girl restrains her. Crushed thus between shyness and love, her mental agony knows no bounds. Some time or other she must get out of it if she is to survive. How she overcomes her shyness is the secret of an astounding poetic genius.

One day a terrible cyclone sweeps over the country blowing away roofs and tiles, and pulling down huge trees and buildings. The thunder roars unceasingly; and the rain pours down in torrents. Sugātri's anxiety for her husband practically living in the garden becomes unbearable. She prays to her family deity, Sarasvati, with her heart and soul to protect her husband. This does not leave her in peace and so goes to the garden all alone without the knowledge of her mother; not even her husband perceives her arrival. To her great surprise and relief, she finds not even a single creeper damaged. Thanking the goddess for the miraculous escape of her husband, she returns home before anybody knows about her secret visit. This unpremeditated event leads to other events as a consequence; emboldened by this visit, she gets rid of her shyness and goes to the garden in open defiance of her mother She works with her husband helping him to water the plants in the garden. Her natural charm shining in its pristine beauty unhindered by ornaments and decorations, her devotion and sympathy manifesting itself in the gentle rise and fall of her breasts in physical exhaustion awake in Salina a spontaneous but profound love for her. He takes her in his arms in the esctasy of that passion.

Her heart throbbing with joy, she goes home only to get her happiness detected by her mother and friends. That night again she is sent to her husband in her heavy make-up with the result that he does not care even to look at her. This attitude of her husband perplexes her innocent heart. She, in her tender love, appeals to him in one of the most delicate and fine passages in the world's literature saying :-

అకటా యేమని దూఱుదాన మిము నాథా వేగుజా మయ్యెఁ బొం
దిక గాఁ బాదము లొత్తరమ్మనుటగానీ యొంటియేమో కదా,
నికటక్షోణికి నేఁగుదె మ్మనుటగానీ కొంత నెయ్యంపుఁ బూ
నికతోఁ గన్నులు విచ్చి చూచుటయొకానీ లేద యొక్కింతయున్.

ఉ. నేఁ డల తోఁటలో నపుడు నిబ్బరమైన మదీయ భాగ్యముం
బోఁడిమి యేమి పాకమునఁ బొందెనొ మీకృప యట్లు గాంచి పె
న్వాఁడిఁ దనర్పు నా చనువున న్మిము నెమ్మియి నంటిఁ గాని యే
నాఁడును బుణ్యసాధ్వికి గుణం బిది గా దని యె నెఱుంగుదున్

క. ఆ యైనఁ గొంత మేల్ నా
రాయణ విమానసుకంటె రహి నిఁక నెపుడున్
మీయంతఁ దడవెదరె...[170]

This finds no response in him whatsoever as he falls into a sound sleep. On the next day she once more visits her husband in the gaden and wins his love with the beauty of her physically exhausted body in its natural state. This behaviour reveals to her intelligent mind for the first time the true temperament and peculiar susceptibility of her husband. As a result of this understanding the barriers between the two souls disappear once for all to the great joy of her mother. She later on advises her daughter to bring her husband home and have a life of ease and happiness.

As days pass by in complete bliss, there occurs an event of minor magnitude which disturbs once more Sugātri's married life. While she gets a boon from Sarasvati that she may have a baby by her husband, the latter also gets another that she may not conceive at all. When they come to know about each other's boon, Sālīna flies into a passion. Unable to control himself he jumps into the Satatāladaghna. For her life without her husband is dark and void. Hence she too throws herself into the lake only to be swallowed up and later disgorged on the bank unhurt by a huge whale. Meanwhile every effort is made to recover his body with no result. With great grief, Sugātri spends her life with her

mother, till she has her summons from God. Left with no more attachments, she starts on a pilgrimage and in the end reaches the temple of Mrgēndravāhana where she comes across her husband. Her doubt about the survival of her husband on the one hand, and the strange powers of a *siddha* on the other prevent her from recognising him. Added to these, manistambha, as that is his new name, has betrayed a new temperament which she has never seen in her husband. He has pierced his ears with an arrow, and his eyes with a style to acquire the supernatural powers of clairaudience and clairvoyance. To her great horror, he brings Kalabhāsini to the temple to sacrifice her to the goddess of Mrgēndravāhana.

Now arises an opportunity to see another aspect of Sugatri's character. When she meets Kalabhāṣiṇi, she is moved to tears. She explains to her the *siddha's* motive in bringing her to the temple and openly and dispassionately censures him :-

. లతాంగీ మొదటనుండి చేరితి వకటా
కలుషపు బావురుఁ బిల్లిని
జిలుక యుఁ బలె విద్ధురాత్ము సిద్ధుని ననుచున్
ఆ కలుషాత్ముఁడు క్రమ్మరి
రాకమునుపె తొలఁగిపోవ రాదా యెటకే
నోకూన యీ మనోజ్ఞత
రాకృతి యేఁ జూడఁ జాల నసిపాల్గాఁగన్.
.. . . ఆస చూపి తో
డ్కొని చనుదెంచెఁ దాఁ దనదు కోర్కి యొనర్పుట కీ విసిందవ
ర్తనుఁడు మనుష్యయత్నమున దక్కఁగ నేరఁడు దూరదృష్టి సా
ధన మయినట్టి పిమ్మట నిత డొనరించు విచార మారయన్. [171]

Thus she shows a sympathetic heart and a fine judgmnt on ethical problems. When Maṇistambha raises his sword to cut off Kalabhāṣiṇi's head, she intervenes to save her forbidding him to strike her in the name of the goddess and ultimately dies only to come to life again in a youthful body.

Her penance at the feet of the goddess, and the sacrifice of her life bestow on her such a power that whatever she utters becomes true. Later on Maṇistambha, Kalabhāṣini and Maṇikandhara meet and tell her their respective stories. The remarks exchanged between Sumukhāsatti and Maṇistambha on the character of Māyā Rambha are really jewels of unsurpassed beauty. Later on the *siddha* and Sumukhāsatti recognise each other when the former explains the cause of his dispute with his wife. Great is her wonder and greater her joy over this unexpected meeting. But soon her heart weeps over the curses incurred by Manikandhara and Kalabhāṣiṇi. Requested by them, she blesses them to be born in their next birth as her son and daughter-in-law.

Later on, at the request of her husband, she exchanges her sex with him and becomes the father of Kalāpūrṇa. These in short are the high lights of her character. Thus the poet, taking hold of a time-old concept of a faithful wife, blows in it the breath of a poet and gives it a soul that is really great and lovable.

MANISTAMBHA, ALIAS SĀLĪNA

Maṇistambha, alias Sālīna, is another character that deserves a close study. Barring those of the Mahābhārata, there is no other character in Telugu literature left more to suggestion than Sālīna. What baffles one is the identity of Sālīna and Maṇistambha who at first glance, appear to be poles apart. Whereas, the former is bashful, (as the name itself denotes) submissive, unambitious and spiritual-minded, the latter is aggressive, ambitious and unscrupulous with an unquenchable thirst for power and riches. How can these opposite qualities go together to give one single character of complete unity? Really, it is a genuine question worth answering for a proper understanding of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam.

When he is of marriageable age, Sālīna, the bashful, is brought into the family of *arcakas* of Kāshmir and married to Sugātri. He must have come of a poor family because he agrees to leave his parents and live with those of his wife. The other reason

for this conjecture is his ignorance of and aversion to costly clothes, jewels and their beauty.[172] Thus his marriage not only puts him in strange circumstances but also paralyses his understanding. Added to these, he should have also experienced the dictatorial temperament of his mother-in-law. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that his heart sinks within itself without betraying his real temperament and appears to be completely bashful. This tendency is again strengthened by another circumstance. On the first night of his marriage with his wife, Sugātri appears in his bed - chamber in such a heavy make-up that he dare not look at her. He sees no sympathetic partner in her, and on the contrary, he is repulsed by the gorgeous dress and jewels. With his love thus suppressed, he falls asleep leaving Sugātri to her own conclusions.

This reaction towards his wife is naturally followed by its logical consequences. His mother-in-law's ambition to have grandchildren being thus frustrated, she develops an antipathy to him and later on goes even to the extent of treating him lighter than a servant. He neither revolts nor protests against it. He completely resigns himself to his fate when he is ordered to look after the garden. What else can he do when he has to depend entirely on her property? To escape this unpleasant state of affairs his mind develops a deep devotion to Sarasvati and great interest in gardening. But this is not the only silver-lining in his life. Had Sugatri's character been different from what it is, his life would have been utterly miserable. Devoted as she is to her husband, she goes to the garden and offers him a helping hand and her exhausted body, which in its peculiar charm awakes his sleeping love for the frist time. He loses no time in deriving full pleasure from it. What is surprising in him is that he does not care even to look at her with whom he has spent a happy day when she visits him that night. She waits and waits in the chamber in the fond hope of being called to bed, but he does not appear even to be aware of her presence. At last she takes courage into her hands and says:-

...... త్రిమ్మటచే శ్రమ మొంది నారుగాఁ
బోలును బోదునా నిదురవోయెద రే.... [173]

The brief dialogue that ensues therefrom is as beautiful as it is staggering. It runs as follows:-

పైకొన్నవరాకున నతఁ
డేకోర్క్యని వచ్చి తనియె నింతియు వగతో
లోకమువారలు పలికడ
కేకోర్క్యని వత్తురనుచు నెంతయు సొలసెన్. [174]

Sugātri, Unable to control herself any longer bursts into a pitiful appeal which falls only on deaf ears. On the next day when she works again with him, Sālīna once more dallies with her as on the previous occasion. This incident opens her eyes to his psychosis namely hatred for heavy make-up and ornaments as well as his special sensitivieness to quivering beauty. Once this sexual complex of his is understood, everything goes on smoothly for both Sālīna and Sugātri. When their mustual love is known, the old woman no longer cracks her whip of authority.

In spite of this happy turn in his life, he never manages to overcome his poverty complex. As days pass by, he comes to know that his wife has obtained a boon from Sarasvati that is completely opposed to him. His anger surges forth; yet he dares neither rebuke nor give a serious punishment to his wife as he is economically dependent upon his mother-in-law. Unable to inflict pain on his wife, his impotent rage drives him to self-mortification as a result of which he throws himself into the Satataladaghna, a fabulously deep lake. By this plunge he reaches the depths where Svabhava is practising *yōga*. Svabhāva receives him kindly, enquires about him and finally sends him away giving him a miraculous sword and a lion to ride on.

Later on Salina with a newly acquired name, Maṇistambha, visits the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana and happens to see the inscription on the pillar. His bitter experiences of life and the promise held out by this inscription, goad him to action by which he can acquire both power and wealth. He pierces his eyes and ears

with a style and an arrow hanging in the temple acquiring thereby the powers of elairvoyance and clairaudience. Once thirst for power and wealth is roused, there will be neither limits nor scruples. Not satisfied with these two powers, he wants to come into possession of a vast empire which can be had, as the inscription prescribes, by sacrificing a young beautiful courtezan well accomplished in music. He searches for such a victim with his two supernatural powers only to find her in Kalabhāṣiṇi. Riding on his lion, he reaches Dvāraka in no time and meets her in secret. His account of Maṇikandhara, and the elaborate and skilful description of the latter's pilgrimage, Rambha's successful efforts to spoil his penance and the arrival of Nalakūbara at the forest - all these gain her confidence in him as well as rouse her temptation to secure union with Nalakūbara. All this he does in such a skilful manner that Kalabhāṣiṇi of her own accord begs him to take her to the forest on his lion. As a precaution he appears at first to hesitate and finally carries her away.

On his aerial path he comes across the friends of Rambha who, on being questioned, inform Kalabhāsini of Manikandhara's disappearance and Rambha's union with her lover Nalakubara. This rouses Kalabhāṣiṇi's suspicion whereupon he promises to get her desire fulfilled in a short time. His manner of landing in the vicinity of the temple of Mṛgèndravahana reveals once more his tact and capacity to play upon the psychological weaknesses of others. There can be no greater testimony to this characteristic than the implicit faith of Kalabhāṣini who cannot be said to be devoid of intelligence and understanding However, his real motive is revealed by Sumukhāsattu as a result of which he had to drag Kalabhāṣiṇi by her hair into the presence of the goddess to sacrifice her. Wishing to lose no time he wields his sword only to cut off Sumukhasattu's head. Before she dies for Kalabhāṣiṇi, she forbids him to kill the latter in the name of the goddess. Not heeding this oath, he again tries to strike when he and Kalabhāṣiṇi are flung far away with such a force that they fall upon a bed of flowers in the neighbourhood of Maṇikandhara's hermitage. Due to this sudden awe-inspiring incident Kalabhāṣiṇi begins to shiver

in that bed by his side. Perceiving her quivering beauty, his psychosis is once again set in motion; he loses control over his emotions, and in spite of himself, tries to violate her chastity. A maiden of character that she is, she cries aloud for help whereupon Māyā Nalakūbara appears on the spot and catches him after pursuit. The latter threatens him with severe punishments if he does not show him the lady that has cried for help. How can Maṇistambha show him Kalabhāṣiṇi who has assumed the form of Rambha? Māyā Rambha in her own interest secures his release from Māyā Nalakūbara who deprives the former of his miraculous sword. Detained thus for his sword, Maṇistambha remains there as a spectator to the conflict that goes on firstly between Rambha and Māyā Rambha, and secondly, between Nalakūbara and Māyā Nalakūbara. Awe and wonder reach such heights that he wants to impart them to some one else. He hastens to the temple of Mṛgendravāhana with his sword to tell the most wonderful story to his audience, Sumukhāsatti, Kalabhāṣiṇi and Maṇikandhara who are introduced to him in proper time. His curiosity is satisfied when Maṇikandhara and Kalabhāṣiṇi admit that they are imposters

Later on Maṇikandhara in his serious effort to console kalabhasini narrates the story of Sugatri and Sālina, and remembering that Sumukhāsatti hails from Kāshmir, asks her how she does not know about it. Thereupon she reveals that she is no other than Sugātri when Maṇistambha claims himself to be that very Sālina. These confessions rousing new hopes, Sumukhasatti demands proof of Maṇistambha's identity. Now a serious problem props up almost beyond solution. This cannot be solved satisfactorily on the basis of Samukhasatti's proposal that Maṇistambha should first tell Maṇikandhara in secrecy the cause of their dispute, that she also should do the same after that, and that, if their accounts tally, they should be considered the same old couple. Though he may not be Sālina, he can divine the secret cause of their dispute and tell it by virtue of his supernatural powers Nevertheless, this very same procedure is followed to establish their identity. Why does the poet resort to such an

apparently invalid procedure? If it is maintained that there is no other way, it will certainly be a grave fault. On the other hand, if it is argued that there are other things which prove their identity, why does not the poet bring them into the focus? Does not this negligence betray a weakness in his creative faculty? The answer is not perhaps as difficult to find as it appears to be. As pointed out at the outset of this examination of the character of Salina, it has been traced back to his weakness for quivering beauty which is characteristically his own. This is too well-known to Sumukhasatti to be forgotten. She should have recognised her husband the moment he told his audience about the effort he made to violate the chastity of Kalabhāsiṇi. Though this identity cannot be guessed when Maṇistambha tells them about his strange behaviour, it can easily be grasped after one hears the story of Sugātri and Sālīna. Thus this weakness for quivering beauty is probably the only point which establishes the identity of Maṇistambha with Sālīna. As to the next question why the poet does not bring this point into the focus when identity is required to be proved, the reply offered here may not be very convincing. Howerver, the following seems to be the only plausible explanation. Having already established their identity beyond doubt, through this weakness for quivering beauty, the poet in his humorous vein seems to be joking at the readers' intelligence so as to keep them on their guard.

Now to resume, Maṇistambha practises *yōga* along with his wife Sumukhāsatti for some time in the temple. Thereafter accompanied by his wife, he sets out on a journey to places of interest. As he sees the ocean, his sexual passion is once again roused. Driven by his peculiar psychosis, he manages to exchange his sex with his wife endowed with he requisite power and gives birth to Kalāpūrṇa. After this event he once more regains his sex and continues the practice of *yōga*

Viewed thus, the character of Maṇistambha is not only very interesting from the point of view of psychology, but also human through and through. Some of the incidents in his life may not

appear strictly realistic, but the complexes, motives and ambitions are strictly natural and human. Sūrana's greatness lies in depicting those deeper corners of the human mind. When psycho-analysis was still a science unknown, how many poets and writers of fiction had probed into such profound depths?

CATURMUKHA ANDH SARASVATI

In the order of their appearance, though Sarasvati and Caturmukha come next, they are in fact the divine source and fountain-head of almost all the characters, events and episodes of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. And as such they occupy a position of the highest importance. From the standpoint of poetic creation also they are unique. Nowhere may one find such heights of imagination akin or parallel to theirs whose thoughts and deeds develop into a most beautiful world of space and time. In conceiving them Sūrana blends the ideal wth the real, the noumena with the phenomena, the abstract with the concrete. This blending as achieved and presented in Sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krīda, does not degrade the noumena to the level of phenomena, or exaggerate the phenomena to that of the noumena. How he does it is the secret of his poetic genius which eludes any imitation or scientific analysis.

One day Caturmukha, the Lord of Creation, and his love Sarasvati, the goddess of arts and sciences, happen to spend a happy time in an adjacent garden. Attracted by her beauty, he takes her into his embrace and gives her such hard kisses with his four faces in succession that she appears to be offended and will not allow him to carry on his dalliance any longer. His desire thus being thwarted, he requests his pet parrot perching on the branch of a tree before him to tell him a story. Pleading her inability to tell a story, the parrot begs to be the listener instead, whereupon he weaves all the deeds of their dalliance into a story and gives it as follows:-

In the city of Kasara there lives a king named Kalāpūrṇa. He is powerful and conquers all the kings in the world with the least effort. The peculiarity with him is he has become a youth

the very moment he is born and is presented with a jewel, a bow and arrows by a *siddha* called Svabhāva. with the help of these gifts he has defeated Madāśaya, another king, and has made him and his wife, Rūpānubhūti his regular slaves.

When the story has reached this point, Sarasvati who has been closely following his narration, instructs the parrot to ask the Lord for the rest of it. He informs the creature in all seriousness that Abinavakaumudi has been married to Kalāpūrṇa and that Sumukhāsatti is his father (Kalāpūrṇa's) and Maṇistambha his mother. Because the father is said to be a female and the mother a male, Sarasvati cannot but laugh. She directly requests him to continue his story. Utilising every detail of their dalliance the Lord tells her as follows:-

Kalāpūrṇa is anointed and declared as a mighty emperor by his minister Satvadatman while Madāśaya builds a fortress for him, and thus enjoys his goodwill. Before long, due to the influence of the emperor's jewel Madasaya begets a daughter Madhuralālasa by name by his wife, Rapanubhuti. Madasaya's four *purōhits,* attracted by the jewel, remain in the emperor's service. One of them presses the jewel too hard to be tolerated. The emperor drives them away with the result that Madasaya also leaves his court along with his wife and the baby. As his daughter fares ill day by day, Madāśaya once again returns to the court. Once the jewel comes into the sight of the baby, she recovers her health. The *purōhits* also once more enter into his service. Thus everything ends in happiness when Madhuralālasa is married to Kalāpūrṇa.

Sarasvati appears to be offended with her lord because her actions have been made the subject matter of the story. He tries to dodge her allegations by asserting once again that it is no more than a simple story; whereupon she explains it with reference to every detail of their dalliance and makes him admit the truth of her explanation. Thus drawn closer to each other in their love, they completely forget the parrot which manages to escape from their presence.

After some tme, Rambha, the celestıal beauty, comes on a vısıt to pay homage to Brahma and Sarasvatı, and hears the parrot repeatıng the pecuhar sound, the *manta*, she has heard emergıng from Sarasvati at the tıme of their dalhance. In her curiosity she extracts from the parrot word by word the whole story of Kalāpūrṇa and of the love of the divine couple when Sarasvatı appears on the scene and curses the poor parrot that ıt will be born as an unchaste woman on the earth. In her great fear Rambha hides herself behınd a pillar nearby. How natural is her reaction: the very nature and mode of cursing reveals the woman pouncıng ın rage upon one of her own sex.

Just at that tıme Caturmukha appears on the scene and comes to know from his wife about the curse ınflicted upon the parrot. Pıtying the poor creature, he consoles her with the assurance that ın her second bırth she will be born as the daughter of Madāśaya and Rūpanūbhūtı, that she will marry Kalāpūrna and that, as the most chaste woman will lıve a long life realısıng all the cherished values. Thıs takes hıs wife by surprıse, and she asks hım whether he ıs stıll dreamıng of Kalāpūrṇa, Madāśaya and others. Beamıng with smıles, he assures her that everything ın the story ıs sure to take place, and that even the strange phenomenon that the father will be a female and the mother a male cannot fail to occur. She knows quıte well that her lord's words come true to the letter. On the one hand, she is very much pleased with her lord for his love for her; and on the other, she ıs very much worried that her love affairs will become the talk of the world. So she forbids hım to let ıt out and deprives the parrot of her knowledge of their love ın her first birth. In her anxıety to keep the whole affair a secret she calls forth Rambha into her presence and threatens her with serıous consequence if she dares to reveal ıt. But Caturmukha ıntervenes sayıng:

నీలాగు మఱి యెవ్వరు నే మెఱింగెద రీ కథ యింకఁ జెప్పినట్టి
వారును వినినట్టివారును, ధాత్రియందుఁబుత్ర పౌత్రాది
బహుసంతతిఁ దనర్చుచుఁ జిరకాలంబు ప్రమదసంపదభివృద్ధి
శోభిత శుభ సౌఖ్యంబులు గాంతు రిది యంతయు నావశ్యకంబుగ
మదీయాశీర్వాదంబు.[175].

This is really a beautiful passage which is a curse from the standpoint of divine beings and a boon from that of the mortals. This utterance cannot but make Sarasvati laugh.

Thus the poet presents these two divine characters as an ideal couple without depriving them at the same time of their spirtual halo. With every thought and action, with every feeling and emotion' with every word and grimace of theirs, one loses one's individuality and completely merges oneself in them. One forgets oneself so completely in the experience that even the idea of judging it to be either high and noble, or low and vulgar does not arise.

ŚALYĀSURA AND ABHINAVAKAUMUDI

The characters dealt with so far do not complete the list; there are still some more luminaries. They may not play a major role, and yet they are too alive and concrete to be ignored. Of these, Śalyāsura, Abhinavakaumudi, Rambha and Alghuvarta are important from many points of view.

The first of this second list is the son of Mahiṣāsurā's maternal uncle. He is a simpleton endowed with immense physical power; tact and diplomacy, thought and foresight are quite foreign to him. Nevertheless his capacity for love or hate is tremendous. These qualities naturally require perseverence for their manifestation. Under the influence of this complex disposition, he resolves to wreak vengeance on the goddess who has killed his uncle, but his fear of Visnu prevents him from translating it into immediate action. As he goes on searching for ways and means of escaping from this punishment. he meets Abhinavakaumudi, an *apsarasa* maiden, and falls in love with her. Her character and temperament being different from his, she refuses him and his love. Though his love is not reciprocated, he does not give it up, but on the other hand he persists in it doggedly. So showy and sincere is his love for her that he even threatens her with terrible consequences if she should reject him. No one, he warns her, will dare to love her as long as he is alive. But Abinavakaumudi is not a weak-kneed maiden to be cowed down by threats. She has a

mind of her own, and a strong will too. Enraged by his threats, she swears in his very presence that she will marry only him who kills Śalyāsura. His love for her is too deep to be offended at this condition. He simply laughs over it and leaves her with the fond hope of winning her love in course of time.

Later on he happens to visit the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana where he reads the inscription informing him that one, who cuts off his head with the scissors in the temple, will not only come to life once again, but will also kill the enemy who makes an attempt on his life. No time is lost by him to undergo this sacrifice and acquire this special power. Now, as Visnu cannot kill him, there is apparently no hindrance to his translating his resolve into action. He is bent upon destroying the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana. Just at this juncture Abhinavakaumudi, who has been searching for the hero capable of killng Śalyāsura, hapens to come to the temple. When he sees her, his love takes possession of him. He plainly tells her of his newly-acquired boon and begs her in all humility to give up her meaningless efforts to avoid him and accept his love. This revelation leaves her in complete bewilderment.

In despair she runs into the temple and seeks the protection of the goddess who advises her to take the sword hidden in the temple, to lead the demon to the Srīsaila and get him killed by Maṇikandhara by the same weapon. That is the only path open to her, the goddess informs her, if she wants to keep up her oath. Losing no time, she emerges from the temple with the instrument of destruction. Salyāsura, who is too simple to know her intention, thinks that she is going to attack him, courting death thereby. Sincere lover that he is, he warns her of its consequences and even forbids her to attack him in the name of the gods. However, following the instructions of the goddess, she leads him on tempting him with the prize of her love. His attachment to her is so strong that it is not until he has travelled the whole distance from the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana to the Srīsaila that he understands her real motive. But what does it avail him when

fate itself is in deep conspiracy against him? Deceived by love, and blinded by hatred of superior powers, he has in the end to face death at the hands of Maṇikandhara whom he kills in turn.

Abhinavakaumudi is not a soft-hearted maiden to be moved by tender feelings. Her will is too strong and her love too rigid to yield to pity. On the other hand, she feels very happy and gladly awaits the rebirth of her husband. When Maṇikandhara is reborn as Kalāpūrṇa, she tells him everything and marries him. In her married life she does not exhibit any new qualities.

RAMBHA

Rambha, the celestial courtezan of Indra and the love of Nalakūbara, is too proverbially beautiful to be commented upon. Her main traits as seen in the poem are, firstly, inquisitiveness about the sexual affairs of her superiors; secondly, the tendency to imitate those whom she deems to be beautiful; thirdly, consciousness of her beauty; fourthly and lastly, her pride in having Nalakūbara as her lover. The first characteristic manifests itself clearely when she hears the peculiar sound (*manita)* reproduced by the parrot in the world of Brahma. She questions the indiscreet creature:-

..... యీ సొంపు మిగులఁ
జిత్ర మిది యయ్యవారిసంసేవ వేళ
నమ్మగా రుగ్గడించిరో..... [176]

She does not hesitate to extract the whole story of Sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krīda and get the sound repeated by the parrot. Unluckily the latter is caught red-handed and condemned to be born as an unchaste woman on the earth. Though Rambha is no less a culprit than the parrot, she luckily escapes this fate due to the timely arrival of Caturmukha. Only a strict warning is given to her. Later on when she is reminded of Brahma and Sarasvati by the presence of a white cloud near the sun, she imitates the *manita* which pleases Nalakubara immensely.

The last two traits are made evident by her reaction to Nāradā's approval of his disciple's statement that the beauty of Kalabhāṣiṇi and her maidens appears to exceed that of the celestial women. Her pride in her beauty is wounded. Though she knows that the remark is endorsed by no less a person than Nārada with immense power, she is not able to acqiesce in it in silence. She wants to make him withdraw his approval and admit the superiority of her beauty, or at least wants to let him know her opinion. She draws the attention of her lover and says:-

క. ఆలించి తె యూపలుకుల
పోలిక దెలియంగఁ గలహభోజనముని గాఁ
బోలు మన మితనిఁ గని యుచి
తాలాపము లాడి చనుట యభిమత మనియెఁ.[177]

Then paying the seer a befitting homage, she invites him and his disciple into the plane and, when he blesses them, she displays her insolence saying:-

క. ఓమునివర మీ దీవన
చే మాపైఁ బ్రేమ కొంత చెడక నిలుచునో
యేమో కాని యిఁక న్నర
భామలపోఁడుముల కితఁడు బ్రమయక యున్నే?[178]

Nārada, being neither thick-witted nor lenient to improper behaviour, demands an explanation. Thereupon she hears once again what the seer has said and remarks in her intolerable pride:-

క. మీరలు పెద్దలు త్రైలో
క్యారాధ్యుల రేమి యన్న నంటిరిగా నె
వ్వారలు మాన్పెద రిది యే
మారసి యాడితిరొ యనుచు నడిగితి ననఘా.

ఉ. ఊహ యొనర్పరో యతిశయోక్తుల [illegible] ట్టి మా
వ్యాహతి చెల్లు నంచునొ యి ట్లాడితి రింతెయ కాక యే పరా
రోహలు మమ్ముఁ బోలమికి రూఢిగ నెమ్మెయి నున్న యీ జగ
న్మోహనమూర్తి యర్థపతి ముద్దుకుమారుఁడె సాక్షి...[179]

The seer in his jocular vein inflicts a curse upon her when he says:- "When your lover is in such deep love with you, you can rightly say whatever you like. But time always does not pass alike. Do you know that you are going to have a rival in your love affairs in the future? When one assuming your form and another his make their appearance, a grave situation may arise causing too much anxiety. So it is not proper to be very proud of this sort of immensely pleasing beauty."[180]

Immediately she comes to her senses and begs him not to continue it any further.

Later on Rambha reaps the consequences of that curse when Kalabhāṣiṇi appears in the form of Rambha. The quarrel that ensues between them shows how the real Rambha, in spite of her divinity, is in no way better than Kalabhāṣiṇi. It reveals more her womanly temperament and character than her divine culture. What is more interesting is that one sympathises with Kalabhāṣini rather than with Rambha.

ALAGHUVRATA

Before this discussion is closed, there is one more character for study which is not altogether un interesting. That is Alaghuvrata, alias Yajñaśarman. He is born in a cultured and spiritual-minded family with a silver spoon in his mouth. His father is well-versed in the Vedas and an expert in *yōga*. Despite his meticulous care, his son, Yajñaśarman, becomes quite incapable of receiving any education. This is not due to any indolence on the part of his father but to his own negligence. To compensate for this deficiency he has acquired two qualities, firstly, implicit and strong faith in his father's words, and secondly, his repentance for not having acquired any education. To make him forget the latter, his father gets him married to four beautiul girls with success. Before he dies, he leaves definite instructions with his son that he should continue feeding pious *brahmanas* at any cost. Yajñaśarman puts them into practice with the result that his property in cluding the jewellery of his wives disappears

before long. Becoming as poor as a church mouse, he does not know how to carry on his father's instructions. At last a new idea flashes across his mind. In his anxiety to get money he does not ponder over its merits and demerits, or his capacity to put it into use. He accepts money from a rich merchant and takes his wives on to his ships under the pretext of going on trade. Just at the moment when he has to part with his wives and to leave them to the merchant, he bursts into loud lamentations over this unthought of separation with the consequence that the faithful wives, suspecting foul play on the part of the merchant, jump into the sea. Because he has broken the contract, the merchant takes back his money and pushes him out. Thus the poor fellow loses not only his money, but also his wives whom he supposes to be drowned in the sea.

Left alone, he goes from country to country seeking means of livelihood. Though reduced to terrible poverty, he does not give up his principle of feeding *brahmanas*. In this hard-pressed condition he happens to visit the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana where he learns from the talk of Kalabhāṣiṇi that one who hears the story of Kalāpūrṇa enjoys riches, prosperity as well as long life and becomes the head of a long and illustrious progeny. Maṇikandhara presents him with the *maṇihāra* which he has received from Krsna. He immediately sits down to penance. At the end of two years he is thrown into the court of a king to whom he presents the *manihāra*.

Adorned with this garland, Madhuralalasa tells him the whole story of Kalāpurṇa, his past history, the fate of his wives, and finally identifies the four Agamas with his sons. Thus, to his great surprise he finds himself in the midst of his sons and riches.

From the foregoing survey of Surana's characters in the Kalapurṇodayam it may be said that they are not mere ideas or sketches, but are conerete and living. They have their own ambitions and aspirations consistent with their mental make-up There

is nothing static or stagnant about them; they act upon and re-act to circumstances as well as to their society. Though some of the incidents in their lives owe their origin to supernatural powers, their minds and hearts are essentially human and completely true to nature. Even gods, goddesses and rsis evince these human tendencies without the least inconsistency with their divine nature. Another peculiarity to be noted is that the characters do not outshine the plot; nor the plot the characters.

CHAPTER VIII

POSITIVE MERITS OF THE KALĀPŪRṆŌDAYAM (Contd)

Turning from characterisation, one may take up the next item for examination namely the background provided for the various events, episodes and characters. On a closer study, its organic connection with the theme will be obvious. Without it there will be neither the story nor the characters; they simply refuse to move, to appear before the mind's eye. As in the works of other poets, it is not simply an appendage, a colour-giving stuff, a mere means of making concrete the when, the where and the how of ideas, but an integral and inseparable part of the whole. This background in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam, for the sake of analysis, can be divided into two, one provided for the events, and the other for characters. Under the first come the reign of Kṛṣṇa, the participation of Nārada, the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana and Kāshmir. Under the second come the geographical, cultural and social background of Kalabhāṣiṇi, Maṇikandhara, Yajnasarman and Abhinavakaumudi.

To take up the first section, the first scene of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam commences in Dvāraka when Srīkṛṣṇa was ruling over the world. Why does the poet select this particular period and place, and in what way does it help the story? Mr.Sūryanārāyana Sāstri in his commentary on the Kalāpūrṇōdayam giving three kinds of reasons enumerates all the important events that take place at Dvāraka. Under the second he provides three reasons from the stand point of the poet. They are firstly, because the poet promises the readers to give a poem worth hearing by virtue of the delienation of sacred and pious theme or things(పుణ్యవస్తు వర్ణ నాకర్ణనీయు), he begins the poem with the description of Dvāraka one of the seven famous cities capable of bestowing *moksa*. Secondly Nandyāla Kṛṣṇabhūpati to whom the poem is dedicated is a Vaishnavite. To please him

the poet has begun with the description of Dvāraka. Thirdly, it manifests the poet's faith in Vaiṣnavism. Under the third he says that Dvāraka helps a great deal to give *purānic* colouring to his story of pure invention[181]. Under the first the commentator does not tell us clearly the invariable connection between Dvāraka and those incidents. Why cannot they take place in some other city than Dvāraka? The second, as he himself says, is not of intrinsic nature. The reason mentioned under the third is probably not important to aesthetic experience because there is no necessity for the poet to give puranic. colouring to the story. On the contrary the poet openly says at the outset that he is giving a completely new or a very wonderful (అత్యపూర్వకథాసంవిధాన వైచిత్రీ మహనీయంబు) story. Moreover, the theme also does not positively require such a colouring.

Thus the question why Dvāraka alone is spoken of as the opening scene of action remains still to be answered. For rea-
150
sons to be mentioned later on, Nārada is essential for the story. His regular visits to some body or to some place for a sufficiently long time are also utterly necessary. Otherwise Kalabhāṣiṇi and Maṇikandhara cannot be expected to meet each other and develop mutual attachment and love. Nārada is not an ordinary mortal to be dragged to any place or person at all. Which place or person can require from him regular visits for a considerable period? It cannot be sacred places of pilgrimage, or monarchs well known for their power and devotion, because Nārada is a *maharsi* far above the needs and wants of mortals. What can attract him, a released soul, is pure devotion to God and music of a high order. Though Rāma is an incarnation of God, he is not known for his music. Moreover, Kṛta, Trēta and Dvāpara ages do not give any scope for making Kalāpūrna a powerful monarch. So avoiding other incarnations and *yugās* the poet has selected Srikrsna and the later part of his reign. What more can be desired on the part of Nārada than attending upon Śrikṛṣṇa, the very incarnation of Viṣṇu. Does not Viśiṣṭādvaita establish beyond doubt that released souls attend upon Lord Viṣṇu? Thus along with Srikrsṇa Dvāraka cannot but come into the picture.

Coming to the second point, why is Nārada brought into the story? To play his role, one must be a divine person with powers to curse and bless, and be proficient in music. He must also be in a position to command respect and honour from the celestial beings such as *devās* and *gandharvās* Besides, he must be capable of knowing everything in all the worlds, the past, the present and the future. His temperament must be such that he takes some sort of dignified interest in clashes and conflicts. Who can satisfy all these needs? Had the poet brought in or created a character *de nove* and endowed him with all these powers, the story would have certainly grown in bulk beyond proportion and the unity would have been ruined, because such a thing demands creation of many events to establish all these characteristics. Even if some other *maharsi* of *purānic* fame had been brought in, he would have lacked proficiency in music and interest in clashes and conflicts which are of vital importance to the story. Supposing Tumburu had been assigned this role of Nārada, could he have done justice to it? He is well known for his proficiency in music. The answer is an emphatic no, since he cannot be expected to command respect from *dēvās* Secondly, he cannot know the story of Kalāpūrṇa which Nalkūbara himself is unable to guess. Lastly, he is not said to be anxious to bring about quarrels and feuds Thus all these considerations leave no other alternative than the selection of Narada.

Regarding the importance of the temple of Mrgendravahana, Mr. Sūryanārāyana Sāstri gives a fairly good explanation when he comments:-

> ఈ మృగేంద్రవాహనాలయకల్పన మత్యద్భుత మధికప్రయోజ
> నము. ఈ గుడి కథారచనలో మధ్యరంగము. ముఖ్యపాత్రము
> ప్రయోజనము లన్నిటి కిది యాధారము. రాకంబముమీది విధు
> లన్నియుఁ గథాపాత్రము లుపయోగించినవే.
> ఇప్పటికి మణిస్తంభుని దూరదృష్టి దూరశ్రవణములు తెలిసినవి
> గదా! మణికంధరుఁడు నాలుక గోసికొని సారస్వత ప్రౌఢిమ
> వడయును. కలభాషిణిని బలి యిచ్చి యుత్తరజన్మమున రాజ్య

and what purpose does it serve? Will the story be affected by giving them some other country nearer to that of Mrgendravahana? Would not proximity to the temple have helped a great deal to secure unity of place? No, it would have on the other hand spoiled two things. Sumukhāsatti would not have taken a long time and become very old by the time she reached the temple; nor the terrible speed of the lion could have been manifested clearly to the readers. If it is purely a question of providing a long distance, the poet would have done well to select Nepal or Assam or the southern most point of South India. But he selected Kāshmir and that with a definite purpose. Maṇistambha comes of a Brahmin family, and *brahmanas* are, generally speaking, spiritual-minded with great aversion to deeds of bloodshed and horror. But Maṇistambha not only pierces his eyes and ears with a style and an arrow, but also tries to sacrifice Kalabhāṣiṇi to Mṛgēndravāhāna. How can this behaviour be reconciled with his caste and up-bringing without any damage to probability which is the life of poetic creations? But for those deeds there would have been no story. And hence, the poet, it may be argued, would have done better to have kept silent over the history of his family. Even this would not have helped him because he and his wife had to practise *yoga* which used to be imparted in those days only to *brahmanas*. The result is that Maṇistambha should be a *Brahmin* and at the same time perform those horrible deeds. To reconcile these apparent incongruities without infringing the laws of probability, the poet had to assign them Kāshmir which is thought to be the seat of *kaula sampardāya*. Tradition says that this *sampradāya* is prevalent among Kāshmiri Brahmins and that it enjoins on them such *tantric rites*. Nowhere else in ancient India such a thing is found among the *brahmanas*. Hence, Maṇistambha and his wife are described as natives of Kāshmir. Above all these, there is a more weighty consideration which is deffered to the next chapter.

Now to turn to the importance of the social background provided for the characters. Kalabhāṣiṇi is said to belong to the courtezan class because of the following reasons. She has to

visit the court of Kṛṣṇa so as to come into contact with Narada and Maṇikandhara, and learn music from Kṛṣṇa and his wives. Secondly, she has to go along with Maṇistambha to the hermitage of Maṇikandhara without the least hindrance from her relatives and friends. Lastly, Sarasvati curses, her that she will be born as a courtezan. This curse, in its turn, is determined by the nature of the fair sex.

In the case of Maṇikandhara there is no such predetermination. Nevertheless, he is said to have come from the *gandharva* class. Had he been simply a human being, it would have been impossible to travel by the aerial path along with his *guru*, Nārada. Besides this, he has to retain his spring time of yough without ever growing old. This trait of his may seem to have no role to play in the story. But a closer study will reveal its necessity. By the time he visits Kāshmir to get his poetic faculty tested, he should have at least been a youth of twenty or twenty-five summers. At that time Sālīna should have been thirty or thirtyfive years old because the latter's dalliance is described as follows:-

అమృతము సేవించితివో
రమణీ యేమైన సిద్ధరస మబ్బెనొ నీ
కౌమరుం బ్రాయము మిక్కిలి
గామ రొందెడు దినముఁ గ్రొత్తక్రొత్తగ నెలమిన్

క. మగవానికంటె మునువుగ
మగువ కెడలుఁ బ్రాయమంద్రు మానవతీ నీ
జిగిబిగువు లంతకంతకు
మిగులఁగఁ బొలుపొందుటకు నిమిత్తము చెపుమా. [185]

When one sees her at the temple of Mṛgēndravahana, her age is described in the following stanza:-

సీ. పసిమి పోనెండిన కసవుబుల్లయుఁ బోలె
నరవెంద్రుకలు వర్ప్య శిరమువలన
ముడిగొన్న మెలఁచిపుక్కుఁ నాలివళ్ళు నా
నిమిరెడు ముదిమి కెప్పొయుంపఁడఁ

గడుఁ జిట్టినట్టి బంగరుపూఁత పొక్కిళ్ళ

వడువు చూపెడి మేనివళులవలనఁ

దునిసి వ్రేలెడు మ్రాఁకుతునుకలఁ దలఁపించు

బాహు వక్షోజ లంబనమువలన

గీ. ఘూక రవములచాడ్పున ఘోరవృత్తిఁ

దనరు ఘన కాస కుహి కుహి ధ్వనుల వలన

భావజుఁడు వెళ్ళిపోయిన పాడు మేడ

పగిదిఁ గాన్పించు ముదుసలిపడఁతి యొకతె. [186]

These lines show clearly that she must be more than sixty. That means more than thirty years should have passed between Maṇikandhara's visit to Kāshmir and to the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana. This makes him more than sixty years old when he made love to Rambha and Kalabhāṣini. Not only that; he gives a terrible fight, more terrible than a youth can to Nalakubara.[187] If Maṇikandhara is simply a human being, this is practically incredible and much less probable.

If the foregoing are the only considerations, Maṇikandhara could as well have been spoken of as belonging to the class of *devas*, or *kinnarās* This argument will lose all its significance if it is only remembered that his class has to be subordinate to that of *dēvās* so as to receive a curse from Nalakūbara, and that *gandharvās* are more well-known for their music than any other class of celestial beings. Thus all these necessitate that he should be a *gandharva*.

Even the same meticulous care is bestowed on Alaghuvrata alias Yajnaśarman. That he is the son of a Malabāri Brahmin, rich, spiritual-minded, well-versed in the Vedas, and thoroughly grounded in *yōga* is necessary and significant. It is helpful not only to give colour and life but also to sow the seeds for future development.[188] Had not his father been spiritual-minded and rich, Alaghuvrata would not have been requested to carry on *annadana*. If his father had not been a *yōgin*, Alaghuvrata would

not have heard something of yoga by which, as explained before, he was able to know the veracity of the story narrated by Madhuralālasa. Because he is said to be a native of Malabar, it has become possible for him to sell his wives to a merchant carrying on *trans-oceanic* trade.

Abhinavakaumudi is said to be an *apsarāsa* of the moon so that she may be able to marry Maṇikandhara in his next birth wothout giving rise to any feeling of incongruity. Does the social, political and geographical background provided for Madāśaya and Satvadātman carry any significance as in the above cases? One can neither positively assert nor deny. It is yet to be enquired into.

With this survey in view, what is one to conclude? Does it not clearly reveal that the backgrould provided for the events as well as for the character is not simply an appendage, a colour-giving stuff, a mere means of making concrete the when, the where and the how of ideas, but an integral part of the whole? How many poets and creative artists have been able to achieve this as Surana has?

NAMA VAKRATA

Pingali Sūrana's peculiarity is not confined only to providing significant background; the very names of his characters are a marvel. They reveal beauties, unheard and undreamt of, unattempted and unachieved. Had *vakrōktikara* the opportunity to have the Kalāpūrṇōdayam before him, he would have certainly included a separate chapter in his treatise under the title, *nāma vākrata*. But he was denied that opportunity, for he came centuries before Sūrana. A critic who was alive to vakrata in the very title[189] of a poem could not be said to be insensitive to *nāmavakrata*. Then why he did not include it in his treatise is, he had no poem from which he could illustrate his point. Now what is this peculiar beauty which Sūrana reveals?

Many are the ways followed by parents in naming their children. They may name them after the gods or goddesses they like and worship, or after their own deceased parents or elders, or after the heroes of the epics or *purāṇās,* or after the heroes for whom they have immense regard, or in accordance with the planetary positions at the time of their births. They may acquire new names in the later part of their lives on account of their deeds and achievements. But the method generally followed by poets is somewhat different. They assign names to the characters in their books in accordance with their character or origin or an event in their life, or they name their characters as their fancy and caprice dictates with the only provision that they do not appear improbable or unreal. The names such as Rama, Bhīma, Bhīsma etc. are in accordance with their character while others like Sita, Sakuntala denote their *origin* or an event in their life. Names such as Prataparudra, Pērigādu, Girīsam, Buccamma come un-

der the second category. The first method followed by poets has too much artificiality. Nevertheless, idealists still have a soft corner in their hearts for this method which may be traced to their unconscious leanings to self-evidence and self-sufficiency. The second method being neither positive nor negative, does not require commendation or censure. Some poets have followed another method by way of *utprēkṣa;* they have tried to establish a definite connection between the name of the character and his or her life though there is apparently nothing of that sort between them. There can be no more beautiful example of this point than Kālidāsā's famous verse:-

> తాం పార్వతీత్యభిజనేననామ్నా బంధుప్రియాం బంధుజనో జుహావ
> ఉమేతి మాత్రా తపసో నిషిద్ధాపశ్చా దుమాఖ్యాం సుముఖీజగామ[1]"

But Sūrana blazes a new trail in this matter. He follows neither the first method nor the second. The names of his characters are not the result of apperception as in the first, or of arbitration as in the second. They are completely determined by the inner events of the story. Every event every word and gesture, every feeling and emotion, every action and reaction in the

dalliance of Sarasvati and Caturmukha becomes a name and a living character Kalāpūrṇa, Satvadātman, Madāśaya, Svabhāva, Maṇistambha and the four Āgamās are the reflected face and the soul of Sarasvati. the heart of Brahma, nature, the jewelled pillar in the lake, and the four faces of Brahma respectively while Madhuralālasa, Rūpānubhūti, Abhinavakaumudi and Sumukhāsatti are the desire, the enjoyment derived from the formal beauty by Brahma, the smile on the face of Sarasvati and the close proximity of Sarasvati's face to the pillar in the lake,[191] Thus these names of characters arise out of the incidents of the story making everything self-sufficient and self-evident. There is nothing of improbability, artificiality or unnaturalness which wipes out the make-believe world of art.

This is not the only peculiarity with the names of Sūrana's characters. Their very names play an important role in their lives, they even determine their fate to some extent. Has anybody ever heard of such things in the annals of history or social science or psychology? What is known is that castes and creeds have played and are still playing havoc with the lives of men. The religious differences in medieval Europe the caste system in India, the race hatred in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, the segregation laws of South Africa and the "brain wash" policy of the Communists in Russia and China are outstanding examples. Sūrana, with his profound psychological insight, goes a step further when he reveals that even names play such a role. This is too subtle to be accepted, and too ingenious to be believed. Unless illustrated, no one can honestly admit this to be true. The names of Maṇikandhara, Maṇistambha and Sumukhāsatti are concrete examples of this unusual function of names.

Supposing the hero of the poem had some other name than Maṇikandhara, would Kalabhāṣiṇi have met with the same fate and the story taken the same course as they do in the story taken the same course as they do in the poem? Certainly not. Kalabhāṣiṇi. in that event. would not have been reminded of

Maṇigrīva and the terrible curse he received from Nārada. Consequently she would not have been afraid of the seer's curse, and much less bothered by Nalakūbara. Thus she could have avoided becoming a victim of Maṇistambha and of the curse of Rambha. On the other hand, she would have awaited her chance which would ultimately lead to her marriage with the hero. Hence, Kalabhāṣiṇī's whole fate and the curse of the story are determined to a very great extent, if not completely, by the name Maṇikandhara.

Similar is the effect of the names Maṇistambha and Sumukhāsatti. Had not Sālīna and Sugātri acquired new names and had they introduced themselves to each other by their old ones, the events from the fifteenth verse of the second canto would have followed altogether a new line. One may say that even the whole story would have gone to peices. The reason for this is not 160 too difficult to be grasped. Had they known each other by their original names, they would have immediately managed somehow or other to recognise and be reconciled to each other. In that case there would have been no attempt on the part of Maṇistambha to sacrifice Kalabhāṣiṇi to the goddess Mṛgēndravāhana. The later developments also would not have taken place. Thus these two names also have in their own way contributed to the structure of the story. In this connection a doubt may arise as to how these difer from disguise and false names which are very common to the comedies of Shakespeare and of Sanskrit play-wrights. In the latter, they are assumed with a definite purpose in view, whereas they are quite unintentional in the former. Sugatri and Sālīna never thought of assuming new names; on the other hand, those were bestowed upon them by the society in which they moved. And hence, disguises and false names do not have anything to do with the present problem.

Thus the poet, Sūrana, blazes a new trail in creative litrature by making the very names of the characters play an important role as well as by making them an integral part of the story.

STRUCTURAL BEAUTIES

In the construction of plot and arrangement of events, Sūrana perhaps is second to none. Nobody knows better than he where to begin a story and where to end, which details to be brought in and which to be omitted. Even the twentieth century which boasts of its advance in techniques has nuch, it seems, to learn from him. There are no less than fifteen parts or episodes in the story of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. They are:-(1) The earlier life of Kalabhasini, (2) Nārada's conflict with Tunburu, (3) Maṇikandhara's pilgrimage, (4) The episode of Maṇistambha, (5)The comedy of errors, (6) the story of Sugātri and Sālina, (7)the dalliance of Sarasvati and Caturmukha, (8) the story of Svabhāva, (9) the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, (10) the episode of Abhinavakaumudi and Salyāsura, (11) the tale of Alaghuvrata, (12) the marriage of Kalāpūrna and Madhuralālasa, (13) Kalāpūrṇā's expedition of conquest, (14) the past history of Satvadātman and finally (15) Liksmi-Nārāyaṇa-Samvāda. That these parts are not arranged in order of their chronology is evident from the very opening of the story. Chronologically speaking, the beginning is the middle, and the middle is the beginning. The poet deliberately adopts this arrangement so that readers may find themselves directly in the mid-stream of the story and become all the more curious to know the succeeding events. To bring about the same effect, this is not the only way. Instead of beginning the story with the introduction of Kalabhāsiṇi, Nārada, Maṇikandhara, Nalakūbara and Rambha directly himself, the poet could have made the baby, Madhuralālasa, narrate the story as it stands. Such an alternative is not altogether ruled out, because the baby has that divine vision. This new arrangement of course involves some changes which are not too difficult to be effected. Why does not the poet follow the latter course instead of the former? Has he gained anything by this method?

Worlds he has gained and nothing he has lost by his own method. If he had followed the second alternative, the story would have become al the more complicated. Instead of securing sus-

pense, this would have contributed immensely to confusion and thereby to tediousness, because this would have landed him in the muddle of weaving a story within a story. That means, the contents of the first four cantos will be nothing but a story within a story. That is rather an aberration than an artistic creation. Secondly, the advantages of dramatic presentation, i.e., directly perceiving the characters as they move, act and struggle, will be altogether denied. Thirdly, the special significance which Madhuralālasā's narration bears will be lost beyond repair. Fourthly, all realism with which it is suffused will fade away into the supernaturalism of the fairy tales. (This statement does not mean that fairy tales are not bealutiful, but what is meant here is that one will have anything but not the poets heart and soul). Fifthly, it will become only a third rate imitation of Bana's Kādambari without its word-music and beautiful imagery. In a word, Telugus and Telugu literature are lucky enough in this that Sūrana did not fall into the snare of the second alternative.

Another interesting point in the first part is the reference to the story of Kalāpūrṇa and to the result that accrues to narrators and the audience without revealing even a single part of it. This is technically known as bindu which intensifies curiosity and secures suspense and continuity. This first part on the Whole introduces to the readers all the important characters and suggests the coming events. Nowhere in Sanskrit drama is this so finely introduced as in the present work.

The second and third parts, i.e.,Nāradā's conflict with Tumburu and Maṇikandhara's pilgrimage to several places are considered by some critics as inappropriate and unnecessary. But these arguments are hardly convincing. If they had been ommitted as these critics advocate, there would have been no cause for Narada's regular visits to Srikṛṣṇa on the one hand, and Kalabhāṣiṇi would not have been so easily duped by Maṇistambha on the other. Besides, there are other considerations also which need not be discussed in this context.

Coming to the fourth, the story of Sālīna and Sugātri is not brought in and narrated by Sumukhāsatti to Kalabhāṣiṇi because of three reasons. Firstly, the tension of feelings so far roused in the minds of readers will be shattered. That is, *Karuna* which is the *rasa* in that context will be nullified by the digression into new avenues resulting in *akandacchēda.*[192] secondly Maṇikandhara will be left with no means to express his sincere belief in Kalabhāṣiṇi's explanation. Thirdly, the element of surprise will lose much of its intensity if the story of Sugātri and Sālīna and their recognition and reconciliation are separated. As a matter of fact, such separation will not be helpful to Maṇistambha and Sumukhāsatti to recognise each other. If the incidents, on the other hand, are transferred *in toto* to the earlier part, the whole story will have to be something quite different from what it is. In that case it will be a demand on the poet to write according to the taste and fancy of other individuals-a demand ethically immoral, aesthetically ugly and politically totalitarian.

Why does not the poet commence the comedy of erros proper with the conflict between Nalakūbara and his counterpart, and end it with Rambha's curse on Māyā Rambha? It is true that the comic element will not suffer in the least by the transposition. The other changes to be effected are also practically nil. Just when Kalabhāṣiṇi cries for protection, Nalakūbara himself may be made to appear on the scene and meet Māyā Rambha first and Māyā Nalakūbara later which will result in the conflict. So far it is good and probable. But the trouble comes in distinguishing the real Nalakūbara from the impostor. How can Māyā Rambha be expected to tdo it? She has never had before any contact with Nalakūbara which can provide a clue to his identification. Nor can Nalakūbara convincingly prove his own identity to a complete stranger. Even granting that he or she can overcome this obstacle by some way or other, the transposition is quite unaesthetic because the character of Kalabhāṣiṇi suffers terribly. In the latter case she will have to spend some time at least with real Nalakūbara. This is not wanted by the story. Secondly

such a behaviour on her part will destroy all our sympathy for her and defeat the purpose of the poet which is to present the psychological workings of a particular kind of soul in a particular environment.

The reasons for making Sarasvati-Caturmukha Krīda the seventh part instead of relegating it to some other part of the story are not very difficult to find. If it is narrated after the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, the story of Svabhāva, the episode of Salyāsura and the other parts, Alaghuvrata will be presented as meeting his sons and wives. Besides, he will be seen as rolling in riches thereby contradicting the boon of Caturmukha. That means he will be shown as enjoying all the fruits ordained by Brahma even before hearing the story of Kalāpūrṇa. Secondly, if the dalliance of Sarasvati and Caturmukha is not given at the head of the above-mentioned parts, the element of wonder and suspense will be lost and the story will become unspeakably tiresome. Hence this episode is given this particular place in the story.

The next three parts, i. e., the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, the story of Svabhava and the epidode of Salyāsura and Abhinavakaumudi are arranged strictly in accordance with the laws of flash-back technique whose sole aim is to maintain curiosity and interest. Why the tale of Alaghuvrata follows these parts and does not succeed the marriage of Madhuralālasa, the conquest of Kalāpūrṇa and the story of Satvadātman is evident on its very face. Its postponement requires a cause to be invented. Such an invention will make the story unnecessarily complicated, without adding any new interest. Nor such a thing will serve any purpose.

The last four parts which comprise the marriage of Madhuralālasa, the conquest of Kalāpūrṇa, the story of Satvadatman and the discussion between Lakṣmi and Nārāyana are intimately connected with each other. Critics headed by Dr.C.R. Reddy have censured the poet for bringing the marriage and the expedition of conquest of Kalāpūrna and Lakshmi Nārāyana-Samvāda into the story. Their arguments are that they have already been suggested in the episode of Sarasvati and

Caturmukha, and that by describing them once more in an elaborate manner no purpose is served except making them tedious and flabby. If these arguments are valid, of course they are not, the tale of Alaghuvrata should have been immediately followed by the story of Satvadatman. Even this, as has been pointed out, is not advocated by them. Omission of the story of Satvadātman makes the work incomplete and defective. Hence, the question where the sotry of Satvadātman should be inserted depends on the importance of the remaining three episodes, the marriage, the conquest and the Lakṣhmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda. If the latter are important and should find a place in the body of the Kalāpūrṇodayam, it is natural for the story of Satvadātman to come after the expedition of conquest. That is the only way of maintaining the interest of the readers and of creating suspense. It may be asked why this cannot be narrated at the very end of the poem. Such an arrangement, it may be argued, will augment suspense all the more. This is not followed because of two reasons. Firstly, the Lakṣhmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda is known by the hero and the heroine with the help of the *maṇihāra*. Without seeking an answer for the immediate question of Satvadātman's past history they well seek after something which does not concern them immediately. For such a thing there must be a cause, and that is lacking. Secondly, it is a custom with all the ancient Indian writers to close their works with benediction. There is an injunction from Patañjali that a work must have an auspicious beginning, middle and end. What can be more auspicious than ending the poem with the Lakṣhmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda. Hence the poem closes with it.

Now one has to face the question whether the marriage, expedition of conquest and the Lakṣhmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda are important and internally needed. Critics have mentioned that they are superfluous and not necessary to the plot. With the foregoing survey in view, can one fall in line with these critics? Can one say that the poet who has given such a close-knit story in the preceding twelve parts has failed in the last three inci-

dents? Can one attribute inefficiency and lack of creative faculty to one who has provided the readers with such a gallery of beautiful characters, significant background and above all *nāma vakrata* which plays such an important role in the inner events of the story? If one should admit that the poet's genius has failed him in this part, he must account for it. As long as this is not explained, his conscience cannot remain at rest In this context Dr.C.R. Reddy says that the poet has become a victim to alamkara sastra in the later parts of the poem. Why should he commit the blunder at the fag end? So one must beg to differ with the critics on their judgment that the last three episodes are unwarranted and superfluous. Against this view it may be argued in this way. It is true that the first twelve parts of the story are closely knit and form a coherent part. But that does not positively prove that the poet has not failed in the last three episodes. Is there any rule that a man who has succeeded on ninety-nine occasions should not fail on the hundredth occasion? At the most what one can say is that the probability of success at the hundredth time cannot be completely denied. That is exactly what is being hinted Because the poet has given such beautiful parts and characters significant background and nama vakrata, he may have some object in view, some purpose to be served, some internal necessity to be satisfied. What that object is, one has to investigate and explain. So judgment on this issue may be deferred in the meanwhile.

THE BEAUTIES OF PRESENTATION

Now Sūranā's methods of presentaton and the beauties therein can be taken up for examination It is well known that there are altogether three methods of presentation, firstly, the dramatic method, secondly, the narrative method and thirdly, an admixture of these two. Again each one may adopt the flash-back technique or the common technique of proceeding from the beginning to the end. None of these methods in itself is beautiful. People may like one method better than the others just as some prefer a certain colour to others This liking or preference

is more a question of temperament or personal predilection than one of beauty. If one is to attribute beauty to the method itself, he has to consider that some literary forms are more beautiful than others. As a matter of fact this view is upheld by some literary critics like Vāmana[193] when he says that plays are better than other forms of creative literature. The reason he advances is also rather strange. In his opinion the play (*rūpaka*), as it contains all the excellences, is attractive like a painted cloth. With due respect to Vamana this question may be put forth. Is the reason self-evident? Is there any rationale in that the Abhijnānaśākuntala is more beautiful than the Kumārasambhava simply because the former is a play and the latter a Mahakavya? Another example which brings out the fallacy more clearly may be provided. If Vāmana's judgment is right, the Prabodhacandrodayam of Kṛṣṇa Misra must be more beautiful than the Kumārasambhavam, or the Pratima of Bhāsa than the Rāmāyana. One may be accused of hiding the real reason provided by Vāmāna for the superiority of a play over other literary forms. Let that also be considered He says that a play is superior to others, because it is the source from which other forms emerge and because all the other literary poems are the result of the ten kinds of play. Now, is this too valid? Simply because one happens to be a father or mother, can anybody say that he or she is invariably superior or better than his or her progeny? It may be argued that the main reason according to Vamana for considering the play to be superior to other literary forms is in its having all the excellences, namely, the fourfold abhinaya. This also is untenable because aesthetic experience or rasa as supported by Abhinavagupta and others is not an effect, and so, aesthetic experience is neither intensified nor lessened directly by the variety of abhinayas. When this point is not conceded, the consequences willl be appalling. There will be no necessity for plurality in fine arts. Nor can other literary forms or fine arts ever be expected to reach the heights of the play. This is exactly the reason why perhaps one of the greatest aestheticians of the modern age, Corce, says:-

"Granted different arts, distinct and limited, the questions were asked: Which is the most powerful? Do we not obtain more powerful effect by uniting several ? We know nothing of this: We know only, in each individual case that certain artistic given intuitions have need of definite physical needs for their reproduction, and that other artistic intuitions have need of other physical means. We can obtain the effect of certain dramas by simply reading them; others need declamation and scenic display: Some artistic intutions, for their full extrensication, need works, song, musical instruments, colours, statuary, architecture, actors; while others are beautiful and complete in a single delicate sweep of a pen, or with few strokes of the pencil. But, it is false to suppose that declamation and scenic effects, and all the other things we have mentioned together, are more powerful than simply reading, or than the simple stroke with the pen and with the pencil; because each of these facts or groups of facts has , so to say, a different object, and the power of the different means employed cannot be compared when the objects are different."[194]

Hence neither beauty nor superiority can be validly attributed to the mere method of presentation. If any preference is shown in this respect, it reveals merely the personal predilection of the critic and not anything concerned with beauty proper.

Having the preceding conclusion in view, how can any one attribute beauties to the methods adopted by the poet without contradicting himself?. It is true that beauty is not confined to any particular method when taken by itself. But when a poet has many methods at his disposal to present a theme, and when he selects only one at one place, and another at another place, he is definitely showing certain preferences. These preferences in the case of great poets cannot be arbitrary and temperamental; on the other hand, these will be deliberately chosen in view of the aesthetic experience. Threfore, to talk of beauties in the methods of presentation in a poem when there is ample choice, is neither selfcontradictory nor irrational.

Now, what are these beauties one comes across in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam?

Pingali Sūrana begins his poem with the dramatic presentation of Nārada, Maṇikandhara, Nalakūbara, Rambha and Kalabhāṣiṇi. Of course as a prelude to this he gives a description of Dvaraka and Kalabhāṣiṇi in the manner of dramatists giving stage directions necessary for the creation of proper atmosphere. Why does he follow this method instead of resorting to direct narration? The reasons are firstly, almost all the important characters can be presented immediately thereby creating immense interest for the readers; secondly, the bulk of the poem well be reduced to the minimum, and thirdly, the *bija* can be brought to the forefront immediately thereby rousing curiosity and creating suspense in the minds of readers.

The next phase of the story, i.e., Nāradā's meeting with Kṛṣṇa, his cultivation of music in the harem and his boon to Kalabhāṣiṇi, is presented by the third method. That means some portions are narrated and others dramatised. This has resulted in bridging the gulf of four years and in concentrating on the important events by shutting out all the unnecessary details.

The succeeding phase begins with a scene in the garden of Kalabhāṣiṇi when Maṇistambha appears all of a sudden. No stage directions regarding the attire and appearance of a character can be more crisp and pointed than the following lines'-

ఉలితపు భూతిపూఁతయును లాతవుఁగోలయుఁ గక్షపాలయు
న్మలఁగొను చిన్నకెంజడలు మందులపొత్తము నాగబెత్తమున్
బలిఁ గనుపట్టు కిన్నెరయు లాహిరిమోదము సింగినాదముం
జెలు వలరంగ నొప్పు నొక సిద్ధుఁడు సింగపు వారువంబుతోన్.

గీ. ఆ భువిదివి నేతెంచి యయ్యబల యున్న
తోఁటలోనికి డిగియె నద్భుతము గాఁగ
నదియుఁ దన్మహిమకు వెఱఁగందు మనము
నల్ల నూల్కొల్పి యర్ఘ్యపాద్యాదు లొసఁగె. [195]

Through the conversation of these two characters one comes to know the conflict of Nārada with Tumburu, the former's advice to Maṇikandhara who afterwards goes on a pilgrimage and finally

his (Maṇikandhara's) penance in the forest. These are all past events which are being now recounted by the *siddha* to the heroine. This flash-back technique is utilised for two definite purposes: firstly, this helps to impart to the reader all the necessary information required to follow the story without taxing his patience; secondly, it occasions surprise in the reader who will become eager to know how this new character who will become eager to learn all these things and in what way he is going to have a part in the story. The elaborate description of Nāradā's conflict with Tunburu on the one hand, and the pilgrimage of Maṇikandhara on lthe other, may appear to be undramatic in form. But it cannot be helped. The poet who is alive to this handicap gets the former narrated by the *siddha* in the form of a monologue. The second is deliberately undertaken by Manistambha so as to convince Kalabhāṣiṇi of his spiritual bent of mind.

170

The fourth part of the story, i.e., Maṇikandhara becoming victim to physical lust, is directly taken by the poet for narraion. Why should the poet introduce a sudden change in the method of presentation? Why has he not made Maṇistambha narrate this too along with the previous incidents? The reasons are quite obvious. The *siddha* has already talked long enough to blunt the edge of surprise. Secondly, a true *siddha* cannot be expected to indulge in the description of amorous deeds. Had he done this, throwing away this decency to the winds, Kalabhàsini would have immediately suspected his horrible intention. One may take objection to the second reason pointing out that the *siddha* has without the least hesitation described the union and that he has given out the secret words exchanged between Maṇikandhara and Rambha. In support of this argument he may even quote the following lines:-

.... ఇఁక నేమి తపమో
మగువ సలుపుచున్నవాఁడు మణికంధరుఁ డా
మృగలోచనతో నది యొక
చిగురుంబొదరింటిలోనఁ జిత్తజు లీలల్. [196]

పరమసంయమిఁ దా నట్లు వ్రతము చెఱిచి
మిగులఁ దుది రంభ చేసిన తగవు వినుము....
కళ లంటి కఱచి తన చె
య్వులఁ జొక్కెడు తపసి మది చివుక్కురుమనఁగా
నలకూబర విడు విడురా
యలసితి నని పల్కె మన్మథాతివివశతన్ ....[197]

But this is beside the point, because the *siddha* does not narrate these events of his own accord. After being requested more than once, he reveals these things taking every care to show his detachment at every step. Let the words of the *siddha* speak in his behalf:-

... తరుణీ యింకఁ దపం
బను మాట గలదె యిదె యా
ఘనుఁ డున్నాఁ డిపుడు రంభ కౌఁగిట ననిమెన్.
... లేవు నాకు నాశంక లెవ్వియు
నెన్ని మార్లు చూడు మన్నఁ జూతుఁ
బడఁతి కలదె జాతిప్రతిమకుఁ జక్కిలి
గింత? నాదు ధృతికి గెంటు లేదు.
నీకు నేమని చెప్పుదు నీరజాక్షి
యడఁచుకొనియెద ననిన నవ్వడపరాదు
పరమసంయమిఁదా నట్లు వ్రతము చెఱిచి
మిగులఁ దుది రంభ చేసిన తగవు వినుము. [198]

The underlined words suggest clearly his detachment, his disapproval of Maṇikandhra's deportment and self-confidence in his moral superiority. Therefore this part cannot be narrated through the medium of Maṇistambha. It may be true that the *siddha* is not the appropriate character to narrate this episode in detail manifesting *sṛṅgāra rasa*, pure and simple. Nevertheless he can, it may be argued, narrate the event suggestively without his detachment being impaired in the least. This argument has no grounds because such a narration under these limitations will be

completely devoid of that particular *rasa* twhich can be manifested by those incidents. Besides, the temperament and character of the *siddha* will gain greater importance than that of the hero proper. Hence the poet seems to have taken the strings of the story into his own hands.

In the succeeding part the poet once again reverts to the dramatic method which gives not only relief but also a concrete picture of Kalabhāṣiṇi enquiring after Maṇikandhara's penance and the whereabouts of Nalakūbara, and of Maṇistambha preparing the ground to encourage her to follow him to the forest. The sixth part consisting of the travel and arrival of Maṇistambha and Kalabhāṣiṇi at the temple, the former's attempt to sacrifice her to Mrgendravahana resulting in their terrible fall on a flowery bed and the meeting of Sumukhāsatti, Kalabhāṣiṇi, Maṇistambha and Maṇikandhara, is presented by the narrative method. This device has enabled the poet to bring in so many incidents in such 172 rapidity that one almost forgets even to breathe. The tempo thus gained and the economy of space thereby effected so compete with each other that it cannot be said which gains the upper hand.

Next comes the 'comedy of errors' presented through Maṇistambha. In so far as it is told by the *siddha,* it is a narrative, but from the mode of presentation it is highly dramatic. The method provides relief after the previous part and helps to make the present episode concrete and picturesque. The real question in this context is, why has the poet selected Maṇistambha alone and not Kalabhāṣiṇi or Maṇikandhara to present this comedy? As a matter of fact the poet himself could have directly presented it in the form of a drama. There are weighty reasons for not following such a course. Had the poet selected Kalabhāṣiṇi to present this story, one would not have the full-fledged comedy because, firstly, she did not know anything about the conflict between Nalakūbara and his counterpart, and secondly, her quarrels with Rambha couldl not be a comedy from her standlpoint. If that cannot be a comedy, can it not at least be a tragedy? And what objection is there to turning it into the latter? There are

altogether two considerations: firstly, it is necessary to provide the reader with a proper perspective of the situation as well as characterisaion, and secondly, proper background or contrast is to be supplied for the coming tragedy so that it may gain more in intensity. The same considerations hold good for not selecting Maṇikandhara also as the agent to present this comedy. Of course there is this difference: while Kalabhāṣiṇi is present inthe first part of the comedy, Maṇikandhara participates in the whole play. Above all these, the element of wonder and surprise would have been lost thereby making the latter portion dealing with identification monstrously dry and drab if the poet had presented it either through Kalabhāṣiṇi or Maṇikandhara. As for the last question, why the poet himself has not directly presented it, the reasons are not too difficult to grasp. Were the poet to undertake the presentation of the 'comedy of errors,' he would have to narrate the part also relating to the identification of Sumukhāsatti, Manistambha, Māyā Rambha and Maya Nalakubara with Sugātri, Sālīna, Kalabhāṣiṇi and Maṇikandhara. In that case the whole contents of the third and fourth cantos will have to be presented by the narrative which by reason of its unwieldy length will grow slow and torpid. Moreover, such a presentation will not be conducive to minimising the psychic distance between the reader and the characters to be presented. In other words, such a narrative method will not help the reader to identify himself with the characters. In view of all these points, it seems, the poet has presented the 'comedy of errors' through Manistambha and has given a work that is superb and unique.

The succeeding part which is a simple revelation from the beginning to the end, is given through the baby Madhuralālasa. The method generally followed in the fifth and sixth cantos is narrative with intermittent questions posed by the other characters. There is no question of adopting the dramatic method here because so many incidents taking place in different worlds at different times are to be brought together within a very short compass. For example, the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha

takes place in the world of Brahma, while the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, the episodes of Salyasura and Yajnasarman take place in the world of human beings at different times. Such episodes naturally canot be summed up in one or two scenes or acts. As a matter of fact rules of drama do not permit it.[199] Hence the poet has followed the narrative method. Now one has to answer why he has selected the baby to narrate these events and not some other character. It is well known that celestial beings are precluded from narrating the story of Kalāpūrṇa by Brahma's words. For mortals it is a closed book and one cannot know it unless he is aided by the *maṇihāra*. Suppose the goddess, Mṛgēndravāhana, had instructed Alaghuvrata how to wear the *manihāra*

and know the story of Kalāpūrṇa. It would not have helped him in any way, because, in that case also Pratimagama etc. would have lacked the means to recognise their father. Instead of creating another event leading to this reconciliation,the poet makes the goddess fling Alaghuvrata into the court of Kalāpūrṇa and thus achieves compactness and intencity of emotions. Even if Alaghuvrata were made to narrate all the relevant events in the king's court with the help of *Maṇihāra,* Kalāpūrṇa, Prathamāgama and others would not have believed him. They would have on the contrary grounds for suspicion and foul play. The same thing would heve happened if any one of the courtiers or officials were to narrate them. Supposing the king Kalāpūrna got the *Maṇihāra* enlarged and then wore it, he would not have told every detailed that is wanted because such a revelation would not in confirmity with his character. Thus Alaghuvrata, Kalāpūrṇa and the cortiers have disqualified themselves to be the narrators. There is one more point to be cognised in this context. The events to be revealed are intimately connected with the dalliance of Sarasvati and Caturmuka, and to describe such a dalliance or sexual union of *devās* is considered to be a great fault and hence strictly forbidden by the *ālamkārikās*. So far, reasons for not selecting other characters than the baby, Madhuralālasa, alone are given.

Now, it may be examined why the baby, Madhuralālasa has been assigned this role. Because she is a baby, she cannot be suspected of any motives in narrating the events. Secondly, the *Maṇihāra* to manifest its supernatural powers to her does not require any enalargement or lapse of time. Thirdly, recounting of Sarasvati-Chaturmukha-Krīda through her will not involve the narration in the *ālankārikadōsa* mentioned before. Fourthly, by way of narrating the events the baby will describe the personal history of her would-be -husband. This means she will behave in a manner that is expected of a *parama pativrata* and thus will make Brahma's words effective.[200] Lastly, the events to be narrated are mainly of wonder and surprise. To get them narrated by a merel baby will greatly enhance their effect. Hence this selection.

The theme except for the story of Satvadatman and the dialogue of Lakṣmi and Nārāyana, is presented by direct narration. Here and there, there may be very brief scenes, but they do not matter much. Why the poet relies on this method is not at all difficult to understand. No amount of ingenuity can help to dramatise the growth of the baby into a beautiful maiden. Much less do the expeditions of conquest lend themselves to this method. This does not mean that it is absolutely impossible. There are dramatists like Eugene O'Neill who have thrown to the winds all the rules advocated by the ancient critics on dramaturgy and yet have succeeded. What is implied here is that the dramatic method cannot be easily adopted. The reason why the last two episodes are narrated by Madhuralālasa is evident and needs no further elucidation.

The foregoing survey thus reveals how the poet has made the best of all the methods of presentation taking every care to avoid monotony, to provide contrast and to bestow the highest significance or suggestivity on the narrator. How many poets can claim this credit?

CHAPTER VIII

KALĀPŪRṆŌDAYAM AS A MAHĀKĀVYA

The critical survey conducted so far should have made it abundantly clear that the characters, the background, the theme and the mode of presentation are intimately and organically connected with each other, that dislocation of any one of them will be detrimental to the whole and that it is self-sufficient and self-evident. Though this review may reveal and establish that the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is a great poem, does this prove it to be a Mahākāvya? Now, before answering this question one has to recollect what is said about the characteristics of the Mahākāvya. In addition to the type of the hero, the elements to be described the principal *rasa* and the nature of the theme, it is necessary to look into some other aspects which have been just passed over. That is the structure of the plot. Under sections two and three of the first chapter there is a definite reference to it, but it has not been discussed as elaboratley as it is required in the present context. So the threads left loose there are to be taken up once more.

A story, whether it is short or long, simple or complicated, active or passive, deals with something begun and something achieved. Such action should be complete in itself resulting in a whole having parts. These parts may be two in some cases, three in some, four in others and five in the rest. Whatever may be the number of these parts, the action presented in a story must be complete without any deficiency. The five parts, or to put it more correctly, the five stages are the beginning, the effort, the possibility of achievement, the certainty of achievement, and finally the achievement.[201]

To differentiate clearly one stage from another it is necessary to know what each division contains.[202] The beginning is that which merely records eagerness about the final achievement of the result with reference to the seed. Striving towards the achievement proper when the same is not in view, and showing

further eagerness about it, is called the effort. When the achievement of the object is slightly suggested by an idea, it is to be known as the possibility of achievement. When one visualises in idea a sure attainment of the result, it is called certainty of achievement. When the intended result appears in full at the end of events and is consistent with them, it is called the achievement.

Now every action presupposes a motive and a cause. It must receive help and support before it attains fruition. Such causes or means leading to the result are technically called the *arthaprakrtis*.[203] They are according to Bharata and other Indian writers on dramaturgy five in number- the seed, the Bindu, the Sub-plot, the Minor-plot and the Denouement. The seed is that which scattered in a small measure, expands itself in various ways and ends in fruition. "That which sustains the contnuity till the end the play even when the cheif object is (from the time being) suspended, is called the *Bindu*.[204] To be more clear, *Bindu* is that which, whenever or wherever there occurs a breakdown in the story due to the introduction of other necessary events, prevents such a sapping and sustains the continuity. As such this may be met with, according to Bharata, any number of times till the end of the play. Abhinavaguptha brings out one more relevant point when he says that the sustainer of the continuity of the story must be pertaining to the hero of the play.[205] While other writers on dramaturgy seem to limit it to the earlier parts of the play, Sāradatanaya cofines it to the parts between the Seed and the Denouement.[206] The event which is introduced in the interest of the main plot and is treated like it is called the Sub-plot. When merely the result of such an event is presented for the purpose of the main plot and it has no *anubandha*, it is called the Minor-plot.[207] The efforts made for the purpose of the Main-plot introduced by the experts, is called the Denouement.

Again, the story worth its name must have some magnitude however small it may be. Everything having magnitude must naturally have some parts and these parts anticipate each other. The relation between the various parts brought together in view

of the particular results is called *sandhi*.[208] There are altogether five parts having relation with each other in full-length plays like the *nātaka* and the *pakaraṇa* and in the Mahākāvya. They are the *mukha*, the *pratimukha*, the *garbha*, the *savimarsa* or *vimarsa* and the *upasamhṛti* or *nirvahaṇa*. That part of a play in which the creation of the seed as the source of many objects and sentiments takes places, is called in consideration of its body, the opening or the *mukha*.[209]

Uncovering of the seed placed in the mukha after it has sometimes been perceptible and sometimes been lost is called the *pratimukha*.[210] The sprouting of the seed, its attainment or non-attainment and search for it is called the *garbha*.[211] Deliberation or pause over the seed that has sprouted in the garbha on account of some temptation, anger or distress is called the *vimarsa*.[212] Bringing together the objects of the *sandhis* such as the *mukha* etc., along with the seed, when they have attained fruition is called the *nirvahana*.[21]

Now how far does the Kalāpūrṇōdayam conform to these general rules enunciated by Bharato and others. Every action that is comprehensive and complete within itself is said to pass through five stages. This is specifically true in the case of the Kalapurnodayam. Kalabhāṣiṇi, as it was explained, thinks that she is in love with Nalakūbara; and to achieve this particular object of hers she requests Nārada to accept her as his disciple in these words:-

సీ. మునినాథ యిట మున్ను వనజదళాక్షుని
యంతఃపురంబున కరుగువేళ
మణికంధరుని దరంగణమున నిల్చి మీ
వీణియ మీరలే పాడఁ బూని
పోవఁ గాఁ జూతు నప్పుడు దాని నేఁ బుచ్చు
కొని కొల్చి వత్తునో యని తలంతు
దేవరచిత్తంబు దెలియమి నల్గ నే
యుగ నెమి చేయునో యనుచు వెఱతుఁ

గీ. గరుణ నంతమాత్రపు టూడిగంబు నాకు
ముదలవెట్టుఁ డటంచుఁ గేల్మోగిచి మిగుల
వినయ మొప్పఁగ నాయింతి వేఁడుకొనియె
నతఁడు నట్ల కాని మ్మని యనుమతించె.[214]

Because this beginning is made to realise her supposed object, this is what is called *prārambha*. There is one peculiarity in this poem. Owing to peculiar circumstances Kalabhāṣiṇi at first does not know that she loves only Maṇikandhara, and thinks for a certain period that she loves Nalakūbara. To relise this mistake, it takes her more than five and a half years. When once she definitely knows it, she loses no time to achieve her object. Therefore, unlike in Sanskrit dramas and narrative poems, the *prārambha* is made for the achievement of something which is other than the real object meant by the heroine. This pecularity which starts in the *mukha sandhi* continues nearly up to the end of the *garbha*, i.e., to the end of the fourth canto.

The second phase of the action is reached when Kalabhāṣiṇi appeals to Maṇistambha saying:-

క. ఈవేళన యతనికడ
కేవిధమున నైనఁ జేర్చు టింతియ తక్కం
ద్రోవ మఱి లేదు నన్నుం
గావన్ క్షణభంగురములు కాంతలతాల్మిల్.

క. తదుపాయము దిద్దుటకున్
మది నెన్నఁ బ్రభావఘనులు మఱి లేరు మహా
భ్యుదయానుభావ గుణ సం
పదఁ బొదలిన మీరు దక్కఁ బావనచరితా!

సీ. ఓసిద్ధపురుష మీ రేసరణిని గాని
చన్న నేమగుఁ దక్కు శంక గలదె
నీమహత్త్వముఁ గానని జడాత్మ జే మున్న
నేమి [illegible]

వేఱొక్కగతిగ భావింపర మముబోంట్ల

సంస్పర్శమాత్రంబు సమ్మతింప

నుచితంబు గాదంటి రుచితంబె మఱి నాదు

ప్రాణహానికి నోర్చు టరసి చూడఁ

గీ. బలుపలుకు లేల యింక నా చెలులు గిలులు

నేఁగు దెంచి విఘ్న మొనర్తు రిత మెఱుఁగక

కావునం గొనిపొమ్ము శీఘ్రంబ నీదు

వెనుక నిడుకొని నన్ను మద్విభునికడకు.[215]

She leaves her home in haste in order to meet her supposed lover Nalakūbara.[216] Hence this is *Yatna*.

On her way, when Kalabhāṣiṇi comes to know from Rambha's friends that Rambha is spending her time with Nalakūbara, the possibility of attaining her object becomes dismal. Later on as she hears the real motive of Maṇistambha from Sumukhāsatti, her hope altogether disappears. When she gets united with Maya Nalakūbara, she feels that she has achieved her object only to know from Maṇistambha that she has been deceived and her chastity violated. Maṇikandhara's confession opens her eyes for the first time, and she realises that her real love is for Maṇikandhara and for nobody else. Even though Maṇikandhara is prepared to accept her love, fate appears to be aligned against her. Thus the possibility of the attainment of her object practically disappears. At this Juncture, Sumukhāsatti who has obtained a boon from Mṛgēndravāhana blesses Kalabhāṣiṇi with these words:-

... ఓయమ్మ, మన నెమ్మనంబుల కూర్చు లింతటన పోయె నే మీఁదటనైన నీపతియు నీవు కోరినట్లు మమ్ము గురుభావంబున నరసికొనియెదరు......

క. ..... పరమపతివ్రత

వై వెలయుము రాజ్యవైభవానుభవం బెం

తే వర్తిల్లఁగ నలరుచుఁ

బ్రోవుఁడు మముబోంట్ల నీవిభుండును నీవున్.[217]

This blessing reveals the posibility of attainment of her object i.e., getting married to the very hero whom she loves. Hence the blessing is nothing but *praptyāśa.*

The fourth phase of the action i.e. *niyatapti* is revealed by these words of Kalāpūrṇa:-

> మీబాలికకథ లన్నియు వింటిరేకదా, మీ భాగ్యమువైభవంబునకు నెందు నీడు లేదిది మొదలు నాకు మీర అత్తమామ లైతిరి. సందియంబు లేదు.[218]

The last phase of the action, the *phalayôga,* is depicted in the marriage of Madhuralālasa and Kalāpūrṇa, and the latter's conquest. Thus all the five phases of action mentioned by Bharata and his followers are to be found in the Kalapurnodayam.

Now coming to the means or causes leading to the result, the seed is to be seen in Maṇikandhara's description of Kalabhāsini swinging in the cradle of flowers and twigs. He says:-

> తమిఁ బూఁదీఁగలఁ దూఁగుటుయ్యెలలఁ బంతాలాడుచుందూఁగు నా కొమరుం బ్రాయపు గబ్బిగుబ్బెతలయంభ్రముల్ చక్కఁగాఁ జూఁగి మింటి మొగంబై చనుదెంచురీవి గనుఁగొంటే దివ్యమైనీంద్ర నా క మృగీ నేత్రలమీఁదఁ గయ్యములకుం గాల్చాఁచులా గొప్పెడున్.[219]

As this suggests his love for Kalabhāṣiṇi and provides the cause for Rambha being offended and Nārada inflicting a curse on the latter, this is really the seed out of which the whole theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam emerges.

The news about Kalāpūrṇa *(Kalāpūrṇuni śuddi)* which Kalabhāṣiṇi tries to know from Nārada is the *bindu.*[220] Without it there would have been no story, i.e., the theme would have faced a virtual breakdown. Neither Rambha could have recognised her lover nor Alaghuvrata would have tried to know the story of Kalāpūrṇa. Because of this importance, it is referred to again in cantos three and four.

The episode of Sugātri and Sālina is not nly helpful to the fruition of the main action, bīt also spreads over the third, fourth and fifth cantos. Hence it is the *pataka.* The story of Satvadātman is another example because it extends over the fifth. sixth. seventh and eighth cantos.

Regarding the *prakāri* there seems to be a slight difference of opinion. According to Bharata as cited before, the hero of the *prakarī* will achieve no object of his own, but helps the hero, whereas according to Dhananjaya, his story is confined to one part only.[221] In other words, Dananjaya followed by Visvanātha holds that the difference between *patāka* and *prakārī* is that, while the former spreads over more than one part, the latter is confined to one only. But Bharata, on the other hand, stresses on the difference of the minor hero achieving or not achieving his own object besides being helpful to the hero of the main plot. If he achieves it, that episode is to be considered as *pataka*, if he has no particular object of his own to be achieved, but is helpful, that is *prakārī*. According to both these schools the story of the parrot confirming the information passed on to Kalabhasini by the *siddha* is a *prakārī*. Because Alaghuvrata has his own object to be achieved, his story is a *patāka* according to Bharata. It is so according to Dhananjaya also, but the reasons are different. What makes it a *patāka* according to the latter is its extension over the fourth, fifth and sixth cantos.

In the Kalāpūrṇōdayam the denouement is achieved by the marriage of Madhuralālasa and Kalāpūrṇa, and the latter's conquest.

Now, coming to the five *sandhis* or parts, the Kalāpūrṇōdayam being a great poem portraying vast experience in all its colours and shades, contains all of them. The first canto forms the *mukha sandhi* becuase the seed, the beginning and the condition for the sprouting of the seed are more than amply provided. Besides, Rambha's pride in her beauty, Nāradā's curse in a very mild form, and Kalabhāṣiṇi's supplication to the great seer suggest a number of beautiful *bhāvās*. This canto, therefore, forms the *mukha sandhi*.

The second canto and the earlier part of the third which contain the effort and further progress,[222] form the second part or the *pratimukha sandhi*. When Nārada expresses doubt about the sincerity of the wives of Kṛṣṇa in their high compliments paid

to him, Kalabhāṣiṇi rises to the occasion and manages to get a boon from him. After sometime Maṇistambha appears, and the scene provides information about Maṇikandhara and his penance. She leaves her house for Maṇikandhara's hermitage in his company.

The rest of the third and the whole of the fourth canto deal with the fluctuations in the possibility of Kalabhāṣiṇi achieving her object, namely, her sublimated love of Nalakūbara; she for the first time comes to know her real object and the possibility of its realisation. Generally speaking, all the other poets and playwrights depict their heroes and heroines as definitely knowing their objects and striving for their achievement. In the present case it is quite different as pointed out on so many occasions. Due to peculiar objective and subjective conditions Kalabhāṣiṇi thinks that she is in love with Nalakūbara, whereas in reality her heart and soul are craving for Maṇikandhara. In this present part Kalabhāṣiṇi gets rid of her misconception and becomes quite conscious of her real object. The possibility of achieving this end is clearly shown. In addition to this, the *patāka*, the episode of Sugātri and Sālīna are introduced. Hence, these two cantos form the third part or the *garbhasandhi*, [223]

The fifth and the major part of the sixth canto deal with the episodes of Sarasvati and Caturmukha, the birth of Kalāpūrṇa, the story of Svabhava, the episode of Madāśaya, the history of Salyasura and the reconciliation of Alaghuvrata with his wives and sons. The end of the fourth canto leaves the reader entirely in doubt though the possibility of the achievement of the result lurks in his mind. When one comes to the end of the *garbha sandhi*, one begins to wonder how Kalabhāṣiṇi can obtain her object and how Maṇistambha and Sumukhāsatti beget a son without the latter not conceiving at all. The fifth and the major part of the sixth canto solve these problems. This survey carried on up to this point reveals how most of the difficult obstacles are overcome one after another thereby making the achievement certain. But the ground is not completely cleared because the baby's supernatural powers come to an end by the time she is about

to take up the story of Satvadatman. Thus this failure is another obstacle to be overcome. In other words, Satvadatman has yet to know his past history while Kalāpūrṇa has to lead an expedition of conquest. Above all, how a mere baby of not more than two months is able to know all these things is still a question to be answered. This part, thus, shows a further development over that of the *garbha sanddi*, establishes the certainty of achievement and at the same time leaves another obstacle yet to be overcome. Hence this is the *vimsara*.[224]

The fifth part, the *nirvahana sandhi*, commences from the later part of the sixth canto and closes with the end of the eighth. What is suggested by the words of Maṇikandhara at the very beginning of the poem, the real love of Kalabhasini, the conquest of Kalāpūrṇa, revelation of the past history of Satvadātman and the knowing of the super-natural powers of the *manihara* materialise so completely that there remains nothing deficient or wanting. Everything that is begun, and every thing that has propped up during its course comes to a close.

The limbs of parts or *sandhyaṅgas* introduced into the kalāpūrṇōdayam can be seen from the following table:-

Name of the *Sandhi*	Name of the *sandhyaṅga.*	canto in which it is intrroduced	serial No of the verses.*
Mukha	*Upaksepa*	1	149
	Parikara	1	151
	Parinyāsa	1	179-180
	Vilōbhana	1	188-189
	Yukti	1	170-172
	Prāpti	1	193
	Samōdhāna		
	Vidhāna		
	Paribhāvana	1	204-207

* **The serial numbers of the verses refer to those in the text edited by Mr. K. Subbaiah Sastry.**

	Udbhēdana	1	180
	Karana	1	191-192
	Bhēda	3	182
Pratimukha	*Vilāsa*	3	61
	Parisarpa		
	Vidhūta[225]	7	234
	Tapana	6	104
	Narma	3	212-213
	Narmadyuti	5	64-66
	Pragamana	5	59-70
	Nirōdha		
	Paryupāsana	4	26-39
	Vajra	7	228-231
	Puspa	7	130
	Upanyāsa	7	130
	Varṇasamhāra		
Garbha	*Abhūtāharana*	3	82
	Mārga	3	92,94-96
		4	19-25
	Rūpa	3	98-99
	Udāharaṇa	6	37-38
	Krama	3	53-54
	Samgraha[226]	6	64
	Anumāna	3	99
	Prārthana[227]	3	284
	Ākṣipta[228]	3	246
	Tōṭaka	3	261
	Adhibala	2	43 & 46
	Udvēga	3	159
	Vidrava[229]	3.	262

Vimarsa	*Apavāda*	3	106
	Samphēta	6	19-20
	Vidrava	5	217
	Śakti	7	236
	Vyavasāya	6	37
	Prasaṅga	3	140
	Dyuti	6	40
	Nisēdha[230]	6	53
	Virōdhana		
	Ādāna		
	Chādana		
	Prarōcana	5	*The episode of Sarasvati & Caturmukha*
Nirvahana	*Sandhi*		
	Vibōdha	8	150
	Grathana	8	152
	Nirṇaya	8	194-195
	Paribhāṣaṇa		
	Dhṛti		
	Prasāda		
	Ānanda	8	104
	Sama		
	Upagūhana	8	*The episode of Lakṣhmi Nārāyana Samvāda and 206*
	Bhāṣana		
	Pūruavākya[321]	8	268
	Kāvyasamhāra		
	Praśasti[232]		

A closer observation of the above table shows that some limbs are wanting while some of the introduced find place in some other part or *sandhi* than in the specified. This aspect in no way violates the principle of the *ālamkārikās* because Bharata in his Nātya Sāstra says:- "Having *rasās* and *bhavās* in view, poets who are experts in their art should introduce these limbs into appropriate *sandhis.*"

Now, how many of the topics prescribed by the *ālamkārikās* are introduced into this poem? On referring to the table given below, it will be evident that none of the objects specified by them for description is missed. Another peculiarity with the poet is that he does not bring in all these for their own sake. Generally speaking, every student of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam will find that hey are really wanted by the situation. That is why these descriptions are crisp and pointed and enhance the beauty of the story to a great extent. As it has already exceeded the limit, the profound depths the poet thouches in his descriptions cannot but be passed over.

187

Name of the object.	*Canto in which it is introduced.*	*Serial Number of the verses describing.* *
Sandhyas	8	7 - 10; 29 - 30
The sun	8	35
The moon	6	269
	8	14 - 18; 27
Night	6	122
	8	23 - 25
The Dusk	8	11 - 13
Darkness	8	11
Dawn	8	35

* The serial numbers of the verses refer to those in the text edited by Mr. K. Subbaiah Sastry.

Midday	5	187
Hunting	6	236 *(incidentally referred)*
Mountain	5	185 - 190
Seasons	4	87 - 89
	7	176 - 191
	1	141 - 147
Parks	3	17 - 18
	6	224
The sea	4	200 - 205
	6	110 - 112
	1	198 - 201
Amorous dalliances	3	180 - 182; 42
	7	154 - 175
Pangs of love or Vipralambha	6	213 - 223; 247 - 275
		9 - 10
Sage	3	12 - 13
Heaven	2	174 - 183 *mentioned as the scence of action.*
The world of Brahma	5	*Only mentioned as the scene of action.*
The world of Viṣṇu	8	214 - 232
	1	107 - 128
City	2	138 - 155
	5	108 - 112
Yajña	6	172 *incidentally referred.*
	3	276
Battles and war	6	17 - 24
	8	48 - 135

March of the army	8	31 - 49
Marriage	7	58 - 88
Diplomacy	7	244 - 277
Birth of Princes	5	134 -135
	8	260
Sports in water	6	227 - 234
Drinking bouts	1	126 - 135
Gambling	6	118 - 124

Coming to characterisation, the hero of the Mahākāvya,as pointed out in the second section of the first chapter must be a *dhīrôdātta*. The word *dhīrōdātta* is a technical term which means a person having certain characteristics. According to the *ālankārikās dhīrōdātta* is a person who does not indulge in self-laudation. He is neither depressed by adverse conditions nor elated by success, His prowess and steadfastness are as great as his clamness.No amount of trouble and suffering can sever him from his intent and purpose. His temperament is profound and his pride always latent [233]

How far these qualities are to be seen in the hero of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam can be easily grasped if one only reflects once again over what is said in commection with the characterisation of Maṇikandhara.Here,the hero is a dakṣinanāyaka because he equally loves abhinavakaumudi and Madhuralālasa.

THE RASAS IN THE POEM

The principal *rasa* in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam,as it should have been evident, is *sṛngāra*. It is mainly sustained and strengthened by *adbhūta* which also pervades the poem though in a lesser degree. This does not mean that other *rasas* are altogether absent. All the rest are there, but they do not dominate. They are brought in only as parts contributing to the manfestation of the principal *rasa*. This statement will become all the clearer whem illustrated from the poem itself.

The episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha, the passion of Rambha and Nalakūbara for each other, the conjugal love of Sugātri and Sālīna, the married love of Mdhuralālasa and Kalāpūrna, the *svayamvara* husband, the amorous activities of the celestial couple and dalliance of Māyā Rambha with Māyā Nalakūbara-all these manifest *sambhōga śṛngāra.* Even by the laity it can be clearly understood that these represent various types of love-love of different shades and colours, of different degrees and values. Nātyaśāstra, the fountainhead of the Alankarika School, also distinguishes one from the other, but its method is quite defferent from the layman's approach. Ālankārika tradition mentions it to be of three kinds-*dharma-śṛngara, artha-śṛngara and kāma-śṛngara* "When one in discharging the duty arrays his much desired well-being accomplished in many ways and in this connection means like observing vows, austerities and penance are adopted, it is to be known as *dharama-śṛngāra.* Love in which attainment of material gain occurs in various ways is called *artha śṛngāra,* or it may be that love in which the enjoyment of pleasure with women is for the purpose of some material gain. *Kāma-śṛngāra* includes the seduction of a maiden and it causes secret or excited intercourses with a woman.[234]

Judged by this criterion, the love between Sarasvati and Caturmukha, between Rambha and Nalakūbara, between the divine couple, between sugatri and Salina and between Madhuralālasa and Kalāpurṇa represents *dharama-sṛngāra.* The love between Rambha and Manikandhara and between Abhinavakaumudi and Kalapurna is illustrative of *artha-sṛngara* because both the heroines have gained some other object. While Ramnbha has spoiled the penance of Maṇikandhara, Abhinavakaumudi has had Śalyasura killed by the *gandharva* and then has married the hero in pursuance of her vow. The love between Maya Rambha and Māya Nalakubara comes under the last category. This cannot be *sṛngarabhasa* because both Manikandhara and Kalabhasini have been loving each other from

the beginning. Since their union is not in conformity with *dharma* and since they gain no other material object,it cannot but be *kāma-śṛṅgāra*. There is another kind of *śṛṅgāra* depicted in the poem. Sugatri's appeal to her husband in the bed-chamber,her separation from her husband and Yajnasarman parting from his wives come under this division,i,e., *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* When the lovers are separated from each other by some cause or other once agin,it is said to be vipralambha. When the hope is not there,it is simply karuna according to the *alankarikas*. Because Salina and Sugatri on the one hand,Yajnasarman and his wives on the other,have been assured of their meeting by Sarasvati's boon in the fromer case and Somasarma's prediction in the latter,both come under *vipralamnha-śṛṅgāra* The love of Kalabhāṣiṇi and Maṇikandhara Should come under this category if the foregoing definition is valid. Do not they cherish the hope of becoming lovers once agin and getting united,if not in their present birth, at least in thier next birth?Is it not blessed by Brahma and once again assured by Mṛgēndravāhana and wished for by Sumukhāsatti? In spite of all these considerations,it does not come within the scope of *vipralambha* the reason being the death of both the lovers. Get one of them to survive, and you will have vipralambha. Of course it will be slightly qualified resulting in *karuṇa-vipralambha*.

There is one more variety of love which is to be seen in the cases of Manistambha who has exchanged his sex with his wife and Satvadātman, Salyasura and Abhinavakaumudi, and Manistambha and Kalabhāṣiṇi. *Yati's* passion for the figure of a woman carved in stone is also to be included in the above list. The peculiarity in these cases excluding the last is this: it is one-sided love and thus not reciprocated. In the last instance,a man who has to maintain celibacy loses his self-contorl and embraces not a woman in flesh and blood,but a figure in stone. Hence all these are instances of *śṛṅgārābhasa*.--[5]

G. V. Krishna Rao

Coming to the next predominant *rasa,* the nature of the story of Kalāpūrṇa as mentioned by Nārada, Maṇistambha's revelation of the past events to Kalabhāṣiṇi, the old woman Sumukhasatti once again becoming young, detection of the fraud played by Maya Rambha and Māyā Nalakūbara, the reconciliation of Sumukhasatti and Maṇistambha, the baby Madhuralālasa narrating the past histories of Kalāpūrṇa, Svabhāva and Alaghuvrata, Śalyāsura's death in spite of his boon the miraculous escape of Yajnasarman's wives, the four Agamas gaining access to Madasaya, Satvadātman being recongnised as the maternal uncle of Madhuralālasa-all these are instances of *adbhuta.*

Karuṇa finds its manifestaition in the curses inflicted on Kalabhāṣiṇi and maṇikandhara and in the confession and final death of the former. *Vīra* according to our alankarikas is genrally[236] of four kinds-*daya-vīra, dāna-vīra, dharma-vīra* and *Yuddha-vīra.*[237]

192

The expedition of conquest undertaken by Kalāpūrṇa has provided ample scope for the expression of *Yuddha-vīra,* whereas maṇikandhara's fight with Salyasura illustrates *dharma-vīra* *Daya-vīra* and *dana-vīra* are manifested in due order by Sumukhāsatti's death in her efforts to save the life of Kalabhāṣiṇi and by the perseverance of *annadana* even in his poverty by Yajnasarman. The quarrel between Rambha and the impostress and the prattle of the *purōhit* of Kalāpūrṇa are instances of *hasya.* Here an objection may be taken to the inclusion of the former as an instance of *hāsya* on the ground that there is no presentation of unseemly or ridiculous words, actions etc.[238] This cannot be maintained because it actually contradicts the real experience of the reader. Even the sastra is not against it if one only remembers what Bharata says regarding *hāsya rasa.* These are his actual words:-"Now *hāsya* has for its *sthāyin hasa.* It is manifested by the *vibhāvas* such as unseemly dress, ornament, impudence, greediness, quarrel, defective limb, use of irrelevant words, mentioning of different faults and similar other things. By the *anubhavàs* such as the throbbing of the lips, the nose and the

cheek, opening the eyes wide or controlling them, perspiration, colour of the face and taking hold of the sides it should be represented on the stage. The *vyabhicāribhāvas* in it are indolence, dissimulation, drowsiness, sleep, dreaming, insomnia, envy and the like[239].Against this,it may be argued that,though some of the *vibhāvās, anubhavās* and *vyabhicāris* are to be found in the conflict between Rambha and Māyā Rambha and Māyā Nalakūbara, the motive force behind it is not *hasya* and hence it is not and cannot be an instance of *hāsya* It is true that both the parties have fought in all seriousness,but yet the quarrel is so represented that one only laughs without identifying oneself with either of the characters. It is a case of *atmagatahāsya* If this is so, how is one to account for this peculiarity? All rasas, when deliberately and explicity mimicked, become *hasya*. This has been said by Bharata himself,and this is exactly what is meant when the author of the Rasārnavasudhākara says:-

భాషణాకృతి వేషాణాం క్రియాయాశ్చ వికారతః
లౌల్యాదేశ్చ పరస్థానా మేషా మనుకృతే రపి
వికార శ్చేతసో హాసస్తత్ర చేష్టాసమీరితాః
దృష్టే ర్వికాసో నాసోష్ఠ కపోల స్పందనాదయః. [240]

While *bībhatsa* is manifested by the descripition of the battlefield strewn with the dead bodies of soldiers,horses and elephants, *bhayānaka* is depicted through the activities performed in accordance with the rites mentioned in the inscription in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana Kalāpūrṇā's expedition of conquest has provided the background for full manifestion of *raudra*. The instruction of Nārada to Maṇikandhara,the latter's pilgrimage and *Lakṣmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda* are clear instances of *sānta*.

Thus there are all the rasas in the Kalāpūrṇōdayam and the poet has achieved more than what he promised in his introduction.[241] To summarise the theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdaym is not only original, but also contains the five *sandhis* and their limbs.

The hero is a *dhirodatta* and *śṛngāra* pervades the poem attended upon by all the other *rasas*. The poet seems to have followed the injunction of Śāradatanaya to the letter.242 In a word,it is a *Mahākāvya* in which every quality mentioned in the following definition given by Bhōja in his Śṛngāraprakāsa is present:-

> అసంక్షిప్తగ్రంథత్వం అవిషమంధత్వం (శ్రవ్యవృత్తత్వం) అనతి విస్తీర్ణ సర్గాదిత్వం శ్లిష్ట సంధిత్వం చేతి శబ్దగుణాః. చతుర్వర్గ ఫలాయత్తత్వం, చతురోదాత్తనాయకత్వం, రసభావనిరంతరత్వం, విధిని షేధవ్యుత్పాదకత్వం, సుసూత్రసంవిధానకత్వ మిత్యర్థ గుణాః. రసానురూపసందర్భత్వం, పాత్రానురూప భాషణత్వం, అర్థానురూపచ్ఛందస్త్వం, [243] సమస్త లోకరంజకత్వం, సదలంకార వాక్యత్వం, ఇత్యుభయగుణాః. [244]

CHAPTER IX
ON THE MEANING OF THE POEM

The foregoing survey should have abundantly made clear the subtleties, the depths and above all the greatness of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam. But,if they were the only things to be revealed and apprciated,this essay would have never been written. What is the driving force or the central theme of the essay? As it has been pointed out on many an occasion,the central idea or the theme of the Kalāpūrṇōdayam is the complete emergence of art. That is to say the complete process by which a work of art conceived by the poet in accordance which the laws of beauty finds outward artistc expression. That is the keynote of this thesis, that isthe uniqueness of the poem.Had the poet not been inspired by this single idea,the Kalāpūrṇōdayam might not have come into existence at all. The intricacies of the story, the highly complicated nature of the various episodes,the psychological depths manifested through the mental workings of the various characters, the profound unity of an organic nature-all these are the results or by-products of this one single idea. To overlook this idea is to overlook beauty itself. Not only that;the poet in the reader roused by certain marvellously beautiful passages in the poem will be irritated by the apparent lack of unity and he will severely attack the poet Sūrana as Dr.Reddy has done. The other possible alternative is to develop a cold indifference.

These remarks are likely to appear to be selfcontradictory in view of the statement that the word, the pigment, the medium, the content taken in itself and by itself has nothing to do with Beauty. A poet or any artist in general has to work in some medium,has to take some theme or other to produce a work of art. Neither the medium nor the content can by itself make a work beautiful. When that is accepted, how can anybody say that simply because the poet has taken the theory of the complete emergence of art as his theme, the poem has become unique?

Every poet or artist must have some content or other; one may take social problems, another political problems, another those of religion and a fourth man those of philosophy.If one begins to evaluate beauty in terms of themes, there can neither be universality nor objective criterion by which one can measure and judge. Moreeover, a thing which cannot be expressed quantitatively cannot be an object of science.

There is no difference of opinion on this point, but what is meant by the above statement is this. The beauty,the organic unity,the depths of experience and the full significance of the poem cannot be perceived if the content is not taken into account.For a proper perspective and a correct understanding,the idea of the complete emergence of art is necessary. This idea only reveals the unique nature of the Kalāpūrṇōdaym. Is this contradictory to what has been constantly harped upon?

If what is said above is agreed to,one has to face the last question which is more important than any other thing discussed so far. How can it be said that the guiding idea or the creative force of the Kalapurnodayam is the idea of the complete emergence of art? Is it not a notion of one's own creation? It it really belongs to the poet,and if he wants his reader to approach his work from that angle,why have not the critics seen it so far and not adjusted themselves accordingly? Does not this fact show that the poet, if he had really this idea in creating his work,has miserbly failed in his attempt? Instead of appreciating the work itself,is not the author of such a theory betraying his own predilection and there by his ignorance?

If the main thesis is borne out by the poem,one need not bother about the prevaling non-cognition of this significance. Therefore,it is of primary importance to show that the subject-matter or content of the Kalapurnodayam is the complete emergence of art. This point is not a pure creation or concoction but by nine solid facts, all internal not external and hence doubtful or polemical. They are firstly, the highly complicated nature of the poem, secondly, references to nature of poetry and *phalasruti;*

thirdly, Maṇikandhara's antecedents and subsequent activities; fourthly, the names of Maṇistambha and Sumukhasatti, their native conunty and their family deity; fifthly, the episode of Sarsvati and Caturmukha; sixthly, the names of Kalāpūrṇa, Abhinavakaumudi, Madhuralālasa, Suprasāda and Sarasa; seventhly, introduction of philosophy; eighthly, the poet's ardent hope of getting publicity for his poem through the coperation of *śāstravyasanātidhanyas* and finally, the very title of the poem. Unless explained and illustrated, all these points are sure to be unintelligible.Let these facts be discussed point by point so that one may arrive at the correct perspective. What is meant by the highly complicated nature of the poem is this:-The poem contains so many episodes that, for any casual reader, it is very difficult to remember them a few days after their first reading. As a matter of fact,even at the time of first reading;some may find it difficult to follow the story without often referring to the preceding events. Why should the poet make it so compplicated as to tax the memory of the readers?Had he the mind,he could have made it simple and given a number of beautiful poems. Nothing could have prevented him from making each one of the stories of Kalabhāṣiṇi, Sugātri, Alaghuvrata, Śalyāsura, Sugraha, 'the comedyof errors', Kalāpūrṇa and Nārada self-sufficient. The changes required for this transmutation are not at all insurmountable to a poet of Sūrana's calibre. Moreover,he perfectly knows that even a single sentence giving aesthetic experience or *rasa* is a poem. This knowledge of ālankāra *sāstra* is evident when one of his characters describes the poetic qualites:-

సీ. పొసఁగ ముత్తెపుసరు ల్ప్రోహణించినలీలఁ

దములోన దొరయు శబ్దములు గూర్చి

యర్థంబు వాచ్య లక్ష్య వ్యంగ్య భేదంబు

తెలిఁగి నిర్దోషత నెసఁగఁజేసి

రసభావములకు సార్థంబుగ వైదర్భి

మొదలైన రీతు లిమ్ముగ నమర్చి

రీతుల కుచితంబులై తనరారెడు

ప్రాణంబు లింపుగాఁ బాదుకొల్పి

గీ. అమర నుపమాదులను యమకాదులు నగు

నట్టి యర్థ శబ్దాలంక్రియల ఘటించి

కవితఁ జెప్పఁగ నేర్చు సత్కవివరునకు

వాంచితార్థంబు లొసఁగనివారు గలరె?[245]

సీ. శబ్దసంస్కారమెచ్చుటను జాఱఁగనీక

పదమైత్రి యర్థసంపదలఁ బొదలఁ

దలపెల్ల నక్లిష్టతను బ్రదీపితముగాఁ

బునరుక్తిదోషంబు పొంతఁ బోక

యాకాంక్షితస్ఫూర్తి యాచరించుచును శా

ఖాచంక్రమక్రియఁ గడవఁ జనక

ప్రకృతార్థ భావంబు పాదుకొ నదుకుచు

నుపపత్తి యొందు నత్యూర్జితముగ

గీ. నొకటఁ బూర్వోత్తర విరోధ మొదవకుండఁ

దత్తదవయవ వాక్య తాత్పర్య భేద

ములు మహావాక్య తాత్పర్యమునకు నొనరఁ

బలుక నేర్చుట బహుతపఃఫలము గాదె! [246]

When he describes the character Sucimukhi in the Prabhāvatīpradyumnam, he is indirectly telling us about himself in the following verses:-

కాణాదంబును గౌతమీయమును సాంఖ్యంబున్ భుజంగాగ్రణీ

వాణీమార్గము జైమినీయమతమున్ వ్యాసోక్తశాస్త్రంబు వ

క్కాణించెన్ గడుఁ బూర్వపక్షములు జోకంబెంచుచు న్వేంచియ

క్షీణ ప్రౌఢిఁ దిరస్కరింపుచుఁ దుదన్ సిద్ధాంతమున్ నిల్పుచున్

స్వమతి ప్రౌఢి దృఢానుమానముల సంస్థాపించు నేవేళ నె

ద్ది మతం బప్పుడు వానివానిక నుపాధిగ్రస్తతావ్యాప్తి భం

గ ముఖా నేక సుదూషణంబులు వెసం గల్పించుఁ దా నన్యశా
స్త్ర మత స్థాపనవేళ నవ్విహగి దైత్యశ్రేష్ఠుఁ డోహో యనన్.
కావ్య నాటకా లంకార గాన మదన
శాస్త్ర పరిచయ మహిమంబు జాలపాద
భామినీమణి నెఱపె నుద్దామపటిమ
నాయసురభర్త మెచ్చి పురే యనంగ. [247]

So the poet cannot be considered to be ignorant of such a possibility.

At this juncture one may suggest by way of objection that the Mahākāvya was the order of the day. The poet, being a child of his age, was tempted to write a Mahākāvya. If he had split these stories as above, there would not have been any scope for the Mahākāvya. Hence, the point brought into focus is clearly a case of reading one's own thoughts into the poem. This sort of argument does not stand the test of reason, because, if the poets's sole object was only to write a Mahākāvya, that object could have been as well served by Kalāpūrṇa's love and conquest. That alone would have provided him with ample material for the Mahāprabandha. Strictly speaking, the rest of the episodes are not demanded by this literary form. Ergo the question is valid, and the answer proposed here seems to be the only way out.

Thus the poet through the poem as it stands,is hurling world afterworld upon the baffled reader. To say that all this is done with no purpose in view is too much to be believed in the case of Sūrana. Besides, all the nine *rasas* with all their varieties, as shown in the previous section, are brought in. What has determined or necessitated such a manifestation? It cannot be said that the Mahākāvya wants all rasas and their varieties to be manifested because it is sufficient if the principal *rasa* is *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra* or *śānta* attended upon by some or all the *rasās* Now here is it mentioned that all the *rasas* and their various types should be suggested,or that a Mahākāvya would become all the greater and more beautiful by such a suggestion. Ālamkārikās from Daṇḍin to Visvanātha have stressed more on the importance of

quality then on quan/tity. Pingali Sūrana is not such a novice as to be ignorant of it. When he does it in spite of their explicit ruling, it means that he must have a difinite purpose. And what is that purpose if if is not to portray or depict the complete emergence of Art?

Moreover,there is another thing to be taken into consideration. To make the theme unnecessarily involved and complicated is a serious fault which has been universally condemned by the alamkarikas. As a matter of fact,the poet is very much aware of it when he says:-

"తలఁపెల్ల నక్లిష్టతను బ్రదీపితముగ"

If this is denied,one has to accuse the poet along with Dr.C.R.Reddy that he has become a victim to his ambitious scheme and spoiled the poem. On the other hand, if the stand advocated here is accepted, this so-called fault will become a merit of the highest order because it will be suggesting directly the highly complcated nature of the emergence of Art which requires constant reading and careful recapitulation. Now the choice is between the two alternatives: either the poet has no other purpose than to write a Mahākāvya and failed in so far as he has made it highly complicated and thus kept it far from the easy grasp of the reader; or the object of the poet is to treat the complete emergence of Art,and the highly complicated nature of this conception is beautifully suggested by the complicated nature of the theme. To be more simple, is one to see ugliness in the poem and condemn it or to see immense beauty and thus take aesthetic pleasure in it?

The above thesis has another support in the repeated reference to the nature of poetry and *phalasruti* in the body of the poem. At the request of Nārada,Kalabhāsini repeats the *dandaka* written by Manikandhara and remarks:-

సీ. పొసఁగ ముత్తెపుసరు ల్ప్రోహణించినలీలఁ
దమలోన దొరయు శబ్దములు గూర్చి
యర్థంబు వాచ్య లక్ష్య వ్యంగ్య భేదంబు
లెఱిఁగి నిర్దోషత నెసఁగఁజేసి

రసభావములకు నర్థంబుగ వైదర్భి
మొదలైన రీతు లిమ్ముగ నమర్చి
రీతుల కుచితంబులై తనరారెడు
ప్రాణంబు లింపుగాఁ బాదుకొల్పి

గీ. అమర నుపమాదులును యమకాదులు నగు
నట్టి యర్థ శబ్దాలంక్రియులు ఘటించి
కవితఁ జెప్పఁగ నేర్చు సత్కవివరునకు
వాంఛితార్థంబు లొసంగనివారు గలరె?

లయ. చలువ గల వెన్నెలల చెలువునకు సౌరభము
గలిగినను, సౌరభముఁ జలువయుఁ దలిర్పం
బొలు పెసఁగు కప్పురపుఁ బలుకులకుఁ గోమలత
నెలకొనిన, సౌరభముఁ జలువ వసయుం గో
మలతయును గలిగి జగముల మిగులఁ బెం పెసఁగు
మలయపవనంపుఁ గొదములకు మధురత్వం
బలవడిన నీడు మతి కల దనఁగ వచ్చుఁ గడు వెలయఁ
గల యీ సుకవిపలుకులకు నెంచన్. [248]

The only purpose that can be served by this is the establishment of the unconscious love of Kalabhasini for Maṇikaṇdhara. It may be pointed out here as Dr.Reddy does, that Sūrana takes an opportunity to review his poetry and its merits. This is extraneous to the poem in so far as it does not serve any other internal necessity than the above. The greatness of any poet is not revealed by what he boasts of, but by what he actually achieves through his direct expression the poem. So the secound point does not carry any value except suggesting Surana's conception of poetry. One has,therefore,to consider the first point only. Now the question is this:- Is there no other method of suggesting and establishing the unconscious love between Kalabhāṣini and Maṇikandhara than praising the latter's poetic qualites? A negative answer will be highly inconceivable. This can as well be done by making her describe some other qualites of his. Here this are

gument may be interrupted by a counter suggestion that Kalabhāsini, belonging to the courtezan class and being well accomplished in the fine arts,has responded to the poetic qualites of Manikandhara and has thus revealed her high culture. To this the answer is rather simple:-Is the class of courtezans insensitive to ,other values, and high culture confined only to appreciation of poetry? This objection,therefore,cannot be taken seriously. Now, to continue the exposition,why does the poet select this particular way of making Kalabhāṣiṇi describe the nature of poetry when there are other ways open to him? This selection cannot be due to mere chance or accident because poetic faculty is utilised for securing service in the court of Madasaya for the four Āgamās. This also could have been effected by other means. Moreover,there is one interesting point to be noted in this context. *Śrōtriyās* and old *mimāmsakās,* as definitely told by our *ālamkārikās,* are quite insensitive to poetry or any fine art.[1] Yet, Surana,in his enthusiasm to present his idea of the complete emergence of art in concrete shape, overlooks this general characterisitic of *śrōtriyās* and bestows on the *purōhits* this poetic faculty. For what purpose is this done if it is not for depicting the complete emergence of art? How this actually serves the idea of the poet will be discussed later on but it is sufficient for the present if it is conceeded that this utilisation of the poetic way is not arbitrary or accidental.

This thesis is again reinforced by two other major factors, one music and the other sculpture. That these two also belong to the realm of fine arts requires no elucidation and comment. The only quesiton is whether the role given to music in this poem can be assigned to some other thing so that music may be got rid of altogether? Of course this is not an impossible task provided one is prepared to accept some radical changes in the story. In that case,one will have to delete the entire conflict between Narada and Tumburu and a substantial cause has to be invented for the former's regular visits to Krṣna over a sufficiently long time. As a consequence of this,Manistambha has to be deprived of his

dūraśravaṇasakti If however it is felt that these changes are too many and too drastic to be accepted, and that they spoil the very organic nature of the poem, one may in all fairness concede that point. But this concession does not in any way preclude one from saying that the idea read into the poem enhances the beauty and joy of music and bestows greater value on it.

The same thing cannnot be said about the introduction of sculpture when the *Yati* embraces the beautiful woman in stone. The only purpose it serves is to inflict the curse on Sugraha. This can readily be brought about by so many other methods followed in the *purāṇas* The fact that it it can be dispensed with once again underlines the present theory. The *phalaśruti* which forms an intergral part of the story is also favourable to it. Through this the poet is clearly revealing the social function of Art. It plainly says that it bestows on the people. children, grand-children,great-grand-children, so on and so forth, and also long life, increase of wealth, prosperity and happines. If one excludes the first item regarding the progeny, every other function is definitely sanctioned by Bharata also when he says:-

సర్వోపదేశజననం నాట్య మేత ద్భవిష్యతి,
దుఃఖార్తానాం శ్రమార్తానాం శోకార్తానాం తపస్వినాం.
విశ్రామజననం నాట్య మేత ద్భవిష్యతి (?)
ధర్మ్యం యశస్య మాయుష్యం హితం బుద్ధివివర్ధనం.
లోకోపదేశజననం నాట్య మేత ద్భవిష్యతి,
న తత్ జ్ఞానం న త చ్ఛిల్పం న సా విద్యా న సా కలా
న స యోగో న తత్కర్మ నాట్యేస్మిన్ యన్న దృశ్యతే [250]

Hence, if the present interpretation is conceded, this *phalaśruti* gains all the more in significance.

The third important factor in support of this theory is the character of Manikandhara. He is represented as having acquired poetic faculty by the grace of Mrgēndravāhana,and gone to Kashmir with the avowed purpose of getting it tested by those critics

there. It is also mentioned that he is presented with the *maṇihara* by kṛṣna himself. To what extent are these factors wanted by the internal necessity of the story?

Suppose Sūrana has not depicted Maṇikandhara as a poet. In what way does the story suffer? There are only four things to be considered in this context. Firstly, the rite prescribed by the edict in the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana for acquiring poetic faculty should be deleted. One will probably concede that this omission will not be detrimental to the beauty of the poem. Secondly,Kalahbhāṣiṇi has to find some other quality than this poetic faculty in Maṇikandhara to express her unconscious love for him. This is neither very difficult not altogether undesirable as it has been already pointed out. Thirdly,comes the *maṇihāra*. It is practically impossible to dispense with it *in toto* if the story is wanted. Without it,the theme will completely break down at the end of the fourth canto. Suppose the *maṇihāra* lost by Sugraha is represented as having been kept in the temple of the goddess and later on flung into the court of Kalāpūrna along with Alaghuvrata. This change also does not considerably affect the story or its beauty. Fourthly,Maṇikandhara's visit to Kāshmir and Lakṣmi-Nārāyaṇa-Samvāda,are to be accounted for in a somewhat different way which is not altogether difficult.The hero can be said to have visited that country in that context of his pilgrimage to holy places while the authorship of is *LakṃiNārāyaṇa-Samvāda* can be attributed to Nārada without the least incongruity. But all the same,that the poet does not follow this method clearly shows that he has his definite purpose of portraying the complete emergence of Art in veiw.

Conceding this,how does the poem as it stands help him to present this idea? Why,a great deal. The mode of Maṇikandhra's acquring the poietic gift clearly suggests that for one to become a poet divine grace is essential, and that no amount of hard cultivation without that grace will make him a poet. Kṛṣṇa's presentation of the *maṇihāra* to the hero makes it clear beyond doubt that poetry,or as a matter of fact any creative art,should be in-

variably associated with comprehensive knowledge of the past, of the present and of the future, The significance of Manikandhara's visit to Kāshmir and his poem dealing with *Laksmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda* will be explained later.

The fourth factor which upholds the present view is the very names of Sumukhāsatti, Maṇistambha, their native county and their family deity. The first two names as pointed out in the section on *nāma vakrata,* are internally determind by *Sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krīda* Yet the selection of these names has also been influenced by the outlook in question. Mani does not mean a simple jewel or ratna. Only that kind of jewel having supernatural power is called a *maṇi.* This intepretation is not an invention or an innovation. Ancient poets and scholars have explicitely mentioned it. Consequently Maṇistamnbha verbally means a jewelled pillar having supernatural or peculiar powers. The word Sumukhāsatti, when literally understood means eager proximity. With these two explanations in the backgorund, it is to be recollected that Kalāpūrna is born to this particular couple. Does not this event suggest someting of aesthetics? Leaving the matter here one may turn to what Bharata has to say on the nature of Drama:-

లోకవృత్తానుకరణం నాట్య మేత న్మయా కృతం
ఉత్తమాధమమ ధ్యానాం నరాణాం కర్మసంశ్రయం.
సప్తద్వీపానుకరణం నాట్యం హ్యస్మి ప్రతిష్ఠితం,
వేద విద్యేతిహాసానా మాఖ్యానపరికల్పితం.
దేవతానా మృషీణాంచ రాజ్ఞా మథ్ కుటుంబినాం,
కృతానుకరణం లోకే నాట్య మి త్యభిధీయతే. [252]
అవస్థా యా తు లోకస్య సుఖదుఃఖసముద్భవా,
నా నా పురుష సంచారా నాటకే సంభవే దిహ.
యస్మాత్ స్వభావం సంత్యజ్య సాంగోపాంగగతిక్రమైః,
అభినీయతే గమ్యతే చ తస్మాత్ వై నాటకం స్మృతం.
లోకస్వభావం సంప్రేక్ష్య నరాణాం చ బలాబలం,
సంభోగం చైవ యుక్తించ తతః కార్యం తు నాటకం. [253]

These lines clearly show that Drama-as a matter of fact Fine Art in general-is the result of a close study and imitation of the world and its ways.[254] By depicting Kalāpūrna as the offspring of Manistambha and Sumukhāsatti, Sūrana is suggesting the same with this modification. Simple imitation will not do. Of course a close study of the world and its ways is necessary. Along with it a Mind[255] or *Ātman* or Soul having supernatual or divine power is all the more essential. When such a Mind comes into closer contact and union with the world and its ways, Kalapurna or a full-fledged work of Art results.

The next point, namely, the importance of Kāsmir, has been to some extent discussed. When the significance of the background which is provided for various characters and episodes in the Kalāpūrnōdayam is examined, the most important thing in this context is this. Kāshmir is the country which has produced almost all the greatest *ālamkārikās*.[256] Bhamaha, Udbhata, Bhattanāyaka, Bhattlollata, Śri Śankuka, Bhattatauta, Ānandavardhana, Rudrata, Mukula, Indurāja, Abhinavagupta, Ksēmēndra, Mahimabhatta, Ruyyaka, Mammata-all these illustrious stars in the firmament of *alamkāra-sāstra* belong to Kāshmir. So it is no wonder if one says that it is the very home of literary criticism. That is why Manikandhara is spoken of as having visited that country to get his poetic feculty tested. It is also mentioned that Kāshmir at that time was plunged in grief due to the tragic end of Sugatri and Salina who are no other than Sumukhāsatti and Manistambha.[257] Do not these events suggest something? If they do, that is well and good, and if they do not, the next point may be taken up for consideration.

The other point in support of this theory is the specific mention of Sārada-pītha and Sarasvati as the diocese and as the family deity of Sugatri and Salina. Why should Sārada-Pītha and Sarasvati be specifically mentioned if the poet has not this Particulaar idea in View ? Some may promptly contradict this argument by drawing attention to the following words of Brahma to Sarasvati:-

''ఆరాజునకు సుముఖాసత్తి యనునది
తండ్రియు మఱి మణిస్తంభనాముఁ
డగువాఁడు దల్లియు నయ్యెదరే'' యన్న
''అం దేమి సందియం బదియు నీదు
చేష్టావిశేషంబుచేతన కాఁగలదు....''

This again may raise the question, why sould the episode of Krida be attributed to Caturmukha and Sarasvati and n;ot to some other god or goddess? In criticism of this question it may be asked: why should the poet select only the idea of concrete emergence of Art and not some other idea? The final answer is that all the events, episodes and characters are ultimately connected with this idea only and that these cannot be explained from any other point of view. In other words this particular idea is the ultimate source from which all the others emerge and gain significance. If doubt still persists, attention may be paid to another episode.

It should have been already quite obvious that without *Sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krīda* there is no Kalāpūrṇōdayam. Now the question is, why should the poet select only Sarasvati and Caturmukha as the heroine and the hero of this episode ? Without the least change, the same events could have been as well connected with either Parvathi and Isvara, or Lakṣmi and Nārāyna This Particular selection, in the light of the foregoing comment and explanation, cannot be definitely attributed to mere chance and accident it must be due to some definite purpose of which the poet is abundantly conscious and to which he gives a very high value when he says:-

తత్తదవయవవాక్య తాత్పర్య భేద
ములు మహావాక్య తాత్పర్యమునకు నొసరఁ
బలుక నేర్పుట బహుతపః ఫలముగాదె!

Now What is that purpose if it is not giving expression to the idea of the complete emergence of Art ? Denial of this planly implies denial of the depth and significance of the poem, and denial to

oneself the righty to enjoy beauty. How the very; names of Sarasvathı and Caturmukha serve the idea when ıt is expressed need not be elaborated here because the reader for hımself can understand ıt very easily.

The sıxth factor in support of thıs vıew ıs the names of Kalāpūrna, Abhınavakaumudi, Madhuralālasa, Suprasāda and Sarasa ın additıon to the hero's conquest. All the names mentıoned here have been shown in a prevıous chapter to have been largly determıned by the events in the epısode of Sarasvatı and Caturmukha. In spıte of it, the name of Kalāpūrna can be replaced by any one of the synonymous names in Sanskrıt for the moon. One may protest ın this connectıon that words like *Sasānka, Sasın, dōṣakara* and the lıke do not fit into the context because they ınvarıably have the suggestion of some fault or other. He may point out that words like *Sītāmsu,* and *Pūrnacandra* are also barred from being ıncorporated because ıf they are used the poet will have to name hıs poem as Sītamsudaya or Pūrnacandrōdaya which necessarıly suggest names of Āyurvedıc medicınes. Of these two arguments, the first ıs really valid, and hence such words as have the suggestivıty of some fault are strıctly to be avoided. The second argument ıs not as valid as the first because the reference to Aurvedıc medicınes can be easıly avoıded ıf the word *abhyudaya* ıs used insted of *udaya.* Therefore, the name *Pūrna* is ımot absolutely necessary ıf the poet has not the ıdea of complete emergence of Art ın hıs mınd.

Regarding the last two names, Suprāsāda and Sarasa, they have no dırect bearıng whatever on the epısode of sarasvatı and caturmukha. And yet the former is saıd to be begotten by Kalāpūrna through hıs first wife, Abhınavakaumudı, and the latter through hıs second wıfe, Madhuralālasa. Fırstly, why should the poet select these two names for the sons, and secondly, why should he assıgn the first name to the son of Abhınavakaumudı and the second to that of Madhuralālasa ? Is there any necessıty to point out that, when one dıscusses the nature of a Poetıc composıtıon and art, *navyata, mādhurya, prasāda, sarasatva* are in-

variably referred to ? In the light of these explanations does not the conquest of Kalāpūrna appear to be more significant? Leaving the sahrdayās to draw their own concllusions, another factor may be taken up.

It is well known that references to *yōga* and to its theory and practice abound in the Kalāpūrnōdayam to an extent that causes wonder and surprise. Besides, there are not only crystal-clear references to Viśistādvaita but also vehement arguments in support of it. There are even condemnations of other schools of philosophy. If there is any doubt, the following passages may be noted:-

అంతయు గాఁగ గౌతమ కణాద మతంబులు భేదవాది సి
ద్ధాంతము జైమినీయ మురగాధిపశాస్త్రముఁ గాపిలంబు న
త్యంతము నాకలించి యవి యాత్మల మెచ్చని పాంచరాత్రరా
ద్ధాంతవిధా సమర్థన సమర్థకృతార్థ మతిప్రదీప్తులన్.

సీ. శ్రీమహితాష్టాక్షరీ మంత్ర జపపరా
యణుల నారాయణధ్యానపరుల
దేవతాంతరచింతనా విదూరులఁ గామ
రోషాదిరహితుల రూఢమతులఁ
జిద చిదీశ్వరతత్త్వ విదులఁ త్రైలోక్యపా
వనచరిత్రుల బుధవంద్యపదుల
నకళంకశీలుర నఖిల శ్రుతి స్మృతి
శాస్త్ర పురాణ విజ్ఞాన ఘనులఁ

గీ. దమకుఁ జక్రికి నిత్యసిద్ధంబు లైన
శేష శేషిత్వములు చింతచేసికొనుచు
నతనిదాస్యంబు గతిగాఁగ నరయు పరమ
వైష్ణవులఁ గంటి సభయై ప్రవర్తిలంగ.

సీ. ప్రకృతి పూరుషులందు బహిరంతరములనె
ప్పుడుఁ జలింపక పరిపూర్ణుఁ డగుచుఁ
దనకు నాదియును మధ్యంబు నంతము సమా
నుఁడు నధికుండు నెందును గలుగక

సర్వజ్ఞుండై సర్వశక్తియై సర్వ ని
యంతయై సర్వాత్ముండై వెలయుమ
సర్వంబుం దనకు శేషముగ సర్వమునకు
శేషి దా నగుచు లక్ష్మియును దాను

గీ. రుచియు రవియుం జంద్రికయుం జంద్రుండు వోలె
నయుతసిద్ధత్వ మొప్పంగ నాదిమిథున
మనంగ సకలవేదాంతవేద్యతం దనర్చు
పరమపదనాథుం బొగడు నీ ప్రౌఢికోలంది.

సీ. తనశక్తికోలంది సత్కర్మము ల్ఫలవాంఛ
మాని కృష్ణార్పణమతిం జలుపుట
ప్రతిషిద్ధకర్మంబు పరిహరించుట విష్ణు
భక్తిపై క్రమమునం బాదుకొనుట
తద్భక్తి గల పుణ్యతముల సంసర్గంబు
దుర్జను లున్నట్టి త్రోవం జనమి
విష్ణుసన్నిధి కళా విఖ్యాత వివిధ ది
వ్యక్షేత్ర తీర్థయాత్రా చరణము

గీ బ్రహ్మచర్యంబుం దమము వైరాగ్యగుణము
వలయు వైకుంఠమును గోరువారి కెల్ల
పీని లోపలం గొన్ని గావింపం గనిన
పృథ చనవు చేర్చుం గ్రమమున విష్ణుపదము. [258]

సీ ఘట మంచుం బట మంచుం గారుయుక్తులం బెంచు
దుష్టతార్కికులకు దూర మగుచు
శ్రుతి యంచు స్మృతులంచు శుష్కకర్మము లెంచు
మీమాంసకుల కప్రమేయ మగుచు
ఝురి యంచు ఖరి యంచు జనులవీనుల నొంచు
శబ్దైకరతుల కసాధ్య మగుచు
మృష యంచు మిష యంచు విషయోక్తిం గలహించు
నద్వైతపరుల కప్రాప్య మగుచుం

గీ. గుప్త విప్తో హ్యాషీకేశ కేశవ యను
భక్తుల కౌకప్పుడును దుర్లభంబు గాక
పరఁగుఁ బ్రకృతివికార దుస్స్ఫూర్తతరము
గురుతరానందకుఖురము వైకుంఠపురము.[259]

As a matter of fact the whole episode of *Lakṣmi-Nārāyana-samvāda* overflows with the philosophy of Visistadvaita.

While in the former verses the cause and the theory of Viśiṣtādvaita is advocated and explained, in the last verse strong language is used against other schools of philosophy asserting that *Vaikuṇtha* can never be attained by their followers. Strictly speaking, are these things required by the poem proper,and if not, why has the poet brought them in ? Dr.C.R. Reddy has chastised the poet for bringing in *Lakshmi-Nārāyaṇa-Samvāda,*[260] the exposition of yōga[261] and the elaborate description of Manikandhara's Pilgrimage.[262] Another critic says that these things are included only to secure the favour of Nandyāla Kṛṣṇabhūpati, a staunch Vaiṣnavite and patron of the poet, when he says:-

> ''ఇతఁడు ..... కళాపూర్ణోదయమునాఁటికి ఫలాపేక్షను మరగి కేవల విష్ణుభక్తుఁ డగు కృష్ణభూపాలుని మెప్పు గాంచ నేయెంచ కాఁగొడుగు పట్టి అద్వైతాదిమత నిరసనము గావించెననియు నూహింపవలెను గాని నిజముగా మధ్వవైష్ణవు డయ్యెనని నిశ్చయింపరాదు. మఱియు విష్ణుభక్తి ప్రచారమునకే యీ కావ్యము నిర్మించె ననియు నూహింపరాదు.''[263]

These sentences clearly appear to reveal more his own sentiments than anything else.

It is felt, therefore, that these philosophical digressions are not occasioned by the internal neccessity. What can be said in this context is, that this very fact strongly supports this thesis. If the poet has not the idea of portraying the complete emergence of Art, these excursions into philosophical realms are unnecessary and superfluous. Which is to be preferred-this view, or the other view which maintains that all the philosophical references are superfluous ? It may be asked in this context, what has philosophy to do with the idea of the complete emergence of Art or the

value of Art in life ? All problems, social, political, ethical and aesthetic, and all human values of science, art and morality in their ultimate analysis depend on epistemology. And epistemology is the very basis of philosophy. Without it there can be no philosophy except dogma and blind faith. How can one explain away the problems of beauty when one is not able to know the nature of the object he perceives, and the nature of the knowledge he experiences ? Even if one tries to propound his theory of art without taking them into considertion, as many modern literary critics are doing, such a theroy cannot be sound and rational. And a theory without the support of reason is in no way better than a dream, or a dogma, or a fleeting thought of fancy.[264]

The eighth factor in support of this theory is the ardent hope of the poet expressed when he says:-

భవ్యత నెల్ల దేశములఁ బ్రస్తుతి కెక్కుచు మీఱి యిమ్మహా
కావ్యము సుప్రసిద్ధ మవుఁగావుత నిత్యము సర్వలోక సం
స్తవ్య నిజస్మృతిన్ వెలయు తాండవకృష్ణకృపన్ బవిత్ర శా
స్త్ర వ్యసనాతిధన్య మగు సజ్జనకోటి యనుగ్రహంబునన్.

The above verse clearely says that, for the eternal publicity and appreciation of his poem in each and every country the poet depends on two things, one, the grace of *Tāndava Krisna*, and the other, the sympathy of those many people who are blessed or become rich by their assiduous devotion to the sacred *Sāstra* or science. In the present context one concerned with the reference to the sacred *Sāstra*. To which sacred *Sāstra* does the poet refer, to the *Vedānta Sāstra*, or to the *Alamkāra Sāstra ?* Because the poet has prefixed the adjective sacred to *Sāstra*. it may be argued, he means only the *Vēdānta Sastra* and nothing else. But this interpretation is unconvincing because there is no reason why ardent devotees of Vēndānta sastra should take so much interest in or show regard for the poem which does not throw any newer light or explain things more clearly than those books already in the field.

-If, on the other hand, it is argued that because the poem deals with Vishnu-bhakti and the sacred places for the Vaisnavites, devotees of Vedanta should sympathise with him, then the poet would have done better to hope for the sympathy of the devotees of Vishnu than for that of the former. If this argument is valid and true, the word Sastra here must refer to the *Alamkāra Sāstra*. This evidently supports the thesis that the central idea of the Kalāpūrnōdayam is the complete emergence of Art. Because the poem has for its theme the complete emergence of Art, the poet is more than justified in hoping for the sympathy of those who are assiduously devoted to Alamkāra Sàstra. Thus, this point also is in support of this theory.

At the top of all these considerations comes in the very title of the poem which gives the highest support to this interpretation. Let the compound word, Kalāpūrnōdayam, be referred to any sanskrit Pundit who has never heard of, or read the poem, or its translation, or adaptation, or an essay on it, for its meaning. He will immediately give two meanings, firstly, the rise of the moon, and secondly, the complete emergence of Art. If he has got some touch with the Alamkāra Sāstra he will immediately withdraw the first because he cannot conceive of anybody using a round-about expression to note the simple moon-rise. so he is sure to yield the palm to the second meaning. Hence the central idea of the Kalāpūrnōdayam is the complete emergence of Art.

Turning to the other side, not even a single argument to throw doubt on this theory is to be found. The only other way to refute this theory, then, is to show the utter impossinbility of tracing such of theory in the poem. That cannot be done either because that theory is not only going to be traced, but also going to be given a clear exposition in the following sections. Therefore, may one be permitted for the present at least to quote this *Kārika of the Vakrōktikara* ?

నూతనోపాయ నిష్పన్న నయవర్త్మోపదేశినామ్,
మహాకవి ప్రబంధానాం సర్వేషా మస్తి రమ్యతా. [265]

CHAPTER X

SŪRANĀ'S PHILOSOPHY

Any theory of Art, if it is to be sound and differentiated from mere opinion, must have its roots in epistemolgy. To know Surana's theory of Art and its emergence, therefore,requires a careful study of his philosophy. It has been observed in the previous chapter that the poet was a staunch Visitadvitin as he manifests himself in the Kalāpūrnōdayam. Consequently it is necessary to know the epistemology, cosmology, ethics and the nature of Release or *Mōksa* as advocated by Viśiṣṭādvaita and then aesthetics. Before these things are taken up for study, one has to examine a question raised by a critic.[266] He says and strongly holds that Sūrana was not a Viśistādavaitin as he pretended to be in the Kalāpūrṇōdaym, that he was an Advaitin through and through and that he had masqueraded as one, only to please his patron, Nandyāla Kṛṣṇabhūpati. As a further explanation,he points out that with the ancestors of the poet devotion to the Sun and Siva and practice of yōga were prevalent. Though the poet was an Advaitin, the critic argues, he was more devoted to Siva and that was why desciptions pertaining to Siva and that was in his works, the Rāghavapāndavīyam,the Kalāpūrnōdayam and Prabhāvatīpradyuimnam. He draws attention also to the fact that vertical caste-mark is even now predominat among the members of Pingali family and accounts for it as being the result of the poet's advocacy of Vaiṣṇavism in the Kalāpūrnōdayam, Another reason which he brings forwards in support of his theory is that the veritical caste-mark is not a sure sign of Visitādvaita because there are a good many Advaitins who are in the habit of using it.

From these remarks two things clearly emerge,firstly,that Surana was an Advaitin, and secondly,his advocacy of Viśiṣṭādvita was only a mask. In support of the first,the critic points firstly to the description pertaining to Siva in his works,and secondly,to

Advaitins putting on vertical caste mark. The two reasons put forth by the critic are really surprising. Nobody who has studied the Pāndurangamahātmyam can say that its author was not a Viśiṣtādvaitin simply because descriptions pertaining to siva and Parvati are found in that work. Nor is the second reason less unfortunate than the first because its deduction is like this:-Some cows are black;this is a cow and therefore this is black. And this is logic!

Even the argument so far pursued is only negative,and one has yet to prove the positive aspect,whether he is an Advaitin or a Viśistādvaitin or the follower of some other school of philosophy. The more dependable guides than historical facts and circumstantial evidences in this respect are the very passages which bear direct or indirect refernces to metaphysics and epistemology in his works,and these are not lacking. Suppose one work, contains passages referring to one shcool of metaphysics whereas another work gives evidence of interest in another school-in that case one has to conclude that there is a change, real or assumed in the poet's outlook. Generally speaking the change is genuine because no one play with his cherished values of human life unless he is dilettante or a crook: Let the same method be applied to Surna's works so as to arrive at the school of philosophy which he favours.

In the Rāghavapāndavīyam,the introduction contains the following passages which bear direct references to the poet's philosophy in general:-

"May Brahman who is known by the name Virūpākṣa,who wears the folwer that is born along with the Goddess Lakṣmi,and that is full of sweet nector,who is well-known to have his abode in Pampahēmakūta and who abides in the heart of Venkatādri of Ākuvīti Timmaprabhu protect the worlds."[267]

శ్రీ వన్గాందఱు రెండు నంద గాని వాసిం బేర్చుచున్ భక్తి సా
మీచీన్యము పెద్ద వేంకటనృపాస్మీలి న్మనస్సాతక
వ్యాపిక్రీంసకు గైవసం బయి సదోదంచ త్పృపావృష్టి స
ధ్రీచీనం బగు కృష్ణ మేఘము జగత్ప్రీతిన్ గడుం జేయుతన్.

లోకైక స్తుత్యునకు ని
రాకృత నవ జన జనుర్జరా మృత్యునకున్
త్రైకాల్యసత్యునకుఁ బా
ణాకృత గిరిరాడపత్యునకు నిత్యునకున్

అధ్యాత్మ తత్త్వ విద్యా
సాధ్యునకు సమస్తయోగిజన హృత్కమలా
రాధ్యునకుఁ గాల దిగనవ
రోధ్యున కధ్యుషిత తిగ్మరుచి మధ్యునకున్

శంకా రుజాపహ త్యాగ
దంకారున కవలితామృత ప్రియ ముఖ ం
త్యంకార భక్తియుక్త్యక
అంకారచితార్యము త్యలంకారునకున్.

ప్రార్థనపర సుర సార్థహి
తార్థకృత త్రిపుర దైత్య హతికిన్ వేదాం
తార్థావన లీలా చరి
తార్థకృత బహుమహర్షి హర్షి తమతికిన్

దక్షముఖ ధ్వంసునకుం
జక్షూభవ దనల కుముదసఖ హంసునకున్
భిక్షాసంరంసునకున్
దీక్షాసఫలిత మనోజ విజిఘాంసునకున్.

పశ్యల్పాలున కలి దృ
దృశ్యద్రష్ట్రాది భేద ధీజాలునకున్
వశ్యావిద్యునకు శమా
వశ్యాసాధ్యునకు నిత్యవైశద్యునకున్.

దేవాసుర నర తిర్యక్
స్థావర బహు జంతుపూర్ణ సంభ్యాతిగ రా
జీవభవాండ ఫలావి
ర్భావాకర వపు రుదుంబర క్ష్మాజునకున్.

దీపిత రాగ శివాత

స్వీ ఫుంద్రేక్షునకు: నాకుపీటిపురాంక

శ్రీ పెద వేంకట నృపధీ

రూపాంబక లక్షునకు విరూపాక్షునకున్. [268]

Does any one of the above verses contain specific reference to the epistemolgy and the nature of Isvara,Jīva and Moks peculiar to Advaita? Moreeover,as there is nothing contray to the principles of Viśiṣṭādvaita,the poet,by the evidence of these verses cannot be called either an Advaitin or Viśistādvaitin. Now the text of the poem proper may be examined to see what it says on this aspect. The first canto of the Rāghvapāṇḍavīyam contains these verses which have some bearing on Philosophy:

అకలుష యౌవనస్థదశ యంతయు దా నడపెన్ నృలోకపా

లకుఁడు శరాంతరంగరిపుల్ నెరయం బొలియుంచుచున్ సమా

ధిక రహితాత్మవర్తన నతిస్థిరుఁ డై ప్రణిధిప్రయుక్తిఁ బా

యక యెపుడుం బ్రధానపురుషాంతరవర్తన నాలకింపుచున్.

ప్రతివదంబును నిజపురోహితమతాను

శీలనమున సదీక్షావిశేషుఁ డగుచు

ననఘమతులైన మునులతో నాత్మయోగ

మొకటి కొద లేకయుండఁ జేయుచును వేడ్క.

మూర్తిత్రయ ధృతి లీలా

వర్తిత నానా జగ ద్భవ స్థితి లయని

ర్వర్తన! సజ్జనసుకృతవి

వర్తాయిత దివ్యదేహ! వారిత మోహా!

ప్రథమతమ వచోంత ప్రస్ఫుట బ్రహ్మవిద్యా

పథపథిక విపశ్చిద్భావ విశ్రామసీమా

పృథు చిదమృత ధారా ధీక్ష్ణ సక్తాకుపీటి

ప్రథిత తిరుమల క్ష్మాపత్యపత్యాగ్రజన్మా. [269]

These verses also fall in line with the above,i.e.,these do not refer exclusively to the metaphysics of Advaita or Viśiṣṭādvaita. Either way these can be interpreted. The second canto contains only two verses which have philosophical implications and they are:-

మాహోనాథ విహార వాహన కృపా మాహాత్మ్య సాహాయ్యకో
త్సాహి శ్లక్ష్ణ కటాక్ష విక్షపిత భక్తవ్రాత సంసార శ్రీ
బాహుళ్యప్రద సంస్మరణ పంపా హేమ కూటాద్రిభో
లాహేవాక విపాక విస్మరిత కైలాసాదికేళీరసా.

బ్రధ్నకోటీ సమాభ్రాజి తేజోఘనా!
బుధ్న భావాప్తి సంపుష్ట సృష్టిద్రుమా!
బుధ్నవద్బోధ సంప్రాప్య దృష్యర్చితా!
గృధ్ను తా పూర్వ కాకృష్ట శిష్టార్చనా!

These two also do not throw any positive light on the problem. The word *budhnavat,* if one is to acept Pedarāmayya's interpretation,means growing,and knowledge according to Advaita cannot be said to grow or decrease. Hence this point is more favourable to Viśiṣṭādvaita which attributes increase and decrease to knowledge. Anyhow,this connot be said to be a clearer indication of the poet's leanings towards Viśiṣṭādvaita. There are five verses which have some metaphysical implications. and these are to be gone through to see whether they throw any light on this question. They are as follows:-

విశ్వేశ్వర విశ్వాత్మక
విశ్వాధిష్ఠాన యఖిల వేదాంత వచ
శ్శశ్వ దభివర్ణ్య మాన మ
హైశ్వర్య నిరీహ నిత్య యభవ శుభమయా!

నిశిత ప్రజ్ఞతఁ జూడ నేవికృతియున్ లేదంద్రు నీయందు నీ
దశ రూపాశ్రయణం బొనర్చుట మదిం. దర్శింప లోకంబులం
దశుభ ప్రక్షయమున్ శుభోదయము నుద్యద్భక్త వాత్సల్యతా
తిశయాత్మీయతఁ జేయ నింతియ గుణాతీతా ప్రసన్నాత్మకా!

అది సకల సదాచారం
బది సర్వజ్ఞాన మది సమస్తజనిఫలం
బొాదవినకొాలంది నొాకప్పుడు
హృదయము నీయందుఁ జేర్తురేని మహేశా!

పారేమాయ విజృంభమాణ పరమబ్రహ్మాత్మమధ్యే హృద
బ్జారాధ్యామల దివ్య మంగళ నిజంగాజస్ర సాక్షాత్క్రియా
ధౌరంధర్య మహత్త్వ పాత్రిత గుణాధఃకారి తాష్టాంగయో
గారూఢి ప్రథమాన మౌనిజన భాగ్యశ్రీ సముజ్జృంభణా!

ఆధునిక సాధునికర స
మాధిదురారాధితా మహత్తరవార్తా
రోధార్థ విహిత మచ్చి
త్తాధిగమా! పెద్ద వేంకటాధిపసుగమా!

These, too, do not put one in any better position than the previous stanzas. The closing verses of the last canto also do not reveal anything more than what has been noted above. After going through the whole of the Râghavapāṇḍavīyam what are the conclusions? Though the poet dedicates his poem to Virūpāksa, there is nothing positively antagonistic to the philosphy of Viśiṣṭâdvaita proper. Nor are there any specific references to the philosphy of Advaita. To argue that the poet must be considered as an Advaitin because he not only dedicates his poem to Virupaksa on the one hand, but also praises visnu in it on the other, is to make too large a claim. If this argument is valid, Rāmakṛṣna who praises both Krsna and Siva in the pānduranga mahâtmyam must also be considered as an Advaitin and this is more than an untenability on its very face. One may protest against this point saying that the case of Rāmakṛṣna is quite different on the ground that he clearly reveals his adamant faith in Viśiṣṭâdvaita by expounding as well as advocating its philosophy. If that is so,the ultimate factor which determines whether

one is an Advaitin or Viśistādvaitin is his philosophy. This can be understood only when the different comceptions of Advaita and Vissistadvaita regarding Jīva,Īśvara and Bhakti are greasped.

The fundamental principle of Advaita is that Brahman alone is absolute and real, and that the Universe, Jīva and Īśvara are unreal. This does not mean that Jīva and Isvara do not exist at all. They do only from the standpoint of the phenomena. Just as a dream is real in that particular state and unreal in the state of wakefulness, so also jiva and Īśvara are real in the state of *samsāra* and unreal in the state of the absolute,Brahman. This is beautifully presented by Vidyaranya when he says:-

మాయాఖ్యాయాః కామధేనోర్వత్సౌ జీవేశ్వరావు భౌ

యథేచ్ఛం పిబతాం ద్వైతం తత్త్వం త్వద్వైత మేవహి॥

When Jīva and Īśvara are unreal and when they are considered to be the products of Maya(V.P.Chapt. 6,S.155), Brahaman becomes naturally the absolute goal. To realise it,i.e.,to become one with Brahman,Advaita advocates *Bhakti* as a means. The worship of *Saguna* Brahman,according to this school,leads to the ultimate goal,Niguna Brahman. This is made clear when the author of Vedāntaparibhasa says:-

సగుణోపాసన మపి చిత్తైకాగ్ర్యద్వారా నిర్విశేష బ్రహ్మ సాక్షా

త్కారహేతుః । తదుక్తమ్ -

నిర్విశేషం పరంబ్రహ్మం సాక్షాత్కర్తు మనీశ్వరాః

యే మందాస్తేఽను కంప్యంతే సవిశేష నిరూపణైః ॥

వశీకృతే మనస్యేషాం సగుణబ్రహ్మశీలనాత్ ।

తదేవావిర్భవేత్ సాక్షదపేతో పాధికల్పనమ్ ॥

ఇతి. సగుణోపాసకానాంచ అర్చిరాది మార్గేణ బ్రహ్మలోక

గతానాంతత్రైవ శ్రవణాద్యుత్పన్న తత్త్వ సాక్షాత్కారాణాం

బ్రహ్మణా సహ మోక్షః!! (Chapt. 8)

Therefore. Isvara,and devotion to him are not absolute realities but only means to the absolute goal. Thus both begin of transitory value, the devotion of an advaitin in spite of his complete dependence upon the mercy of his cherished God will suggest the ultimate goal, Nirguna Brahman. Actually this is the case with Tikkana when he addresses Hariharanātha to whom he dedicates his work in the following verse:

అవగమిత రహస్యాష్టాంగ యోగ ప్రకారో
త్సవ గురుకరుణావిస్తార గాఢప్రశాంతి
ప్రవణహృదయ పద్మోద్భాసి విజ్ఞానసారా
వ్యవహిత పరమానందాను భూత్యైకరూపా!

(ఉద్యో., ఆ.4, ప 435)

This is not a rare verse,and,as a matter of fact,any number of verses having this purport can be eited from the *asvasānta padyās* The same is true not only of Pōtana,but also of most of the poets who are Advaitins through and through.

With the Visiṣtādvatin it is quite different. For him the Self and Īsvara are absolutely real and have not transitory but absolue value. Even in the state of Release,as will be explained in the next chapter,the self does not lose its individuality and become one with Brahman.On the contrary,it attains the communion (*sayujya*) which is quite different from *salōkya, sārupya. samipya* and *svarūpaikya*. In that ever blissful state, the self employed in its special duty will attend upon the supreme self. That means its former devotion continues on a higher plane without being liquidated as in the case of Advaitic *Mōksa*.

Thus *Bhakti* as advocated by the Visiṣtadvaitin has absolute value,and it is an end in itself,whereas *Bhakti,* as advocated by Advaita is of transitory value and only a means whose necessity disappears completely in the state of Release he conceives. When this transitory value of *Bhakti* is suggested by the reference to the belief in Nirguna Brahman,etc. in a work,then alone the author of that work can positively be said to be an Advatin.

On this ground alone Tikkana,Pōtana,and other creative writers,whose philosophy is otherwise unknown,are consiedered Advaitins. Similarly,if Sūrana,whose philosophy is under discussion,is to be considered positively an Advaitin there must be atleast one feference to his belief in Nirguna Brahaman or to the nature of self or knowledge or Realease as conceived by Advaita. Is there even a single reference in the Rāghavapāndavīyam? So this philosphy of Sūrana,as seen in the Rāghvapāndavīyam,is neither Advaita nor Viśiṣtādvaita. When facts disclose this what grounds can there be for stamping Sūrana as an Advaitin?

If not the Rāghavapāndavīyam, the Prabhavatipradyaumnam, may present the poet as an Advaitin and so it is to be examined to see to what extent this particular work testifies to this effect.

This work which was dedicated to the poet's own father throws no more light on this problem than the Rāghavapāndavīyam The introduction to this poem provides the following information - Subsequent to Kalāpūrnōdayam,though the poet wrote many works which were well received by the people,he was not satisfied with them because none of them contained an account of his father and his family. To repay this debt to his father, he wrote and dedicated this poem to his father. The geneology of his family was traced from Gokanamantri of Gautamagōtra By his great *yōgic* powers this Gokana had secured *peka*, a *gandharva* woman, as his slave and wrote *nandaka stava* which earned for him a great name.[271] His wife having no children for a long time,prayed to the Sun who appeared to her in her dream in the guise of a Brahmin and gave her a cucumber plant Thereafter this family increased by leaps and bounds. The names of the poet's grandfather was Suraprabhu while that of his father was Amarēśvara and both of them were devotees of Siva. The poet's father was initiated into the devotion of Siva by one named Somārādhya. No where had the poet proclaimed himself or any member of his family as an Advaitin or Viśiṭādvaitin Were he really an Advaitin as the critic maintains, the poet should have contradicted what he had said in the Kalāpūrnōdayam or at least should have ex-

pressed his strong faith in Advaita in unabbiguous terms One does not come across such an open statement in the whole of the Prabhāvatipradyamnam. On the contrary the poet has mentioned the fact that Gokanamantri wrote *nandaka stava* which is a definite custom with Visistadvaitic poets and not with Advaitins There can be no clearer example than Kṛṣṇdevaraya and Rāmakrsna who had praised the weapons of Viṣnu at the very beginning of their works The other fact is that only the poet's father and grand-father were said to be devotees of Siva while there is no mention of the faith of their predecessors and other members of the same line. So there is reason to think that the Viśiṣtādvaita cult which was followed from the very beginning by that family was the cause of the use of vertical caste-mark by the memberes of the Pingali family at the present day After all, this may be only a conjecture and one is not immediately concerned with it because the point under discussion is not dependent upon its truth. The fact mentioned by the poet that his father and grand-father were devotecs of Siva,does not tell us that they were purely Advaitins. On the other hand, the very fact that Sūrana's on the father had been initiated in his devotion to Siva by Somārādhya indicates that his father had embraced the Aradhya faith. Even ignoring this and granting that they were Advaitins, it does not preclude the poet from becoming a Viśistādvaitin. Therefore,if one is to prove that the poet is an Advaitin or a Viśistādvatin, he has to depend entirely on the poet s own words bearing philosophical implication and on nothing else. Except one, none of the verses describing his father's greatness has any reference to philosophy. Even this verse implies only such a general principle that one cannot definitely say whether he was an Advaitin or not. The theme of the poem which deals with the story of Pradyumna,the son of Kṛṣṇa,also is not helpful in any way. There are altogether three verses which refer directly to philosophy and they too do not say anything about the leanings of the poet. Recently a pandit has pointd to the following verse saying that it contains a difinite reference to *pratyabhijna* school of philosophy.

ప్రద్యుమ్నుండు ప్రభావతీ రుచిర బ్రహ్మమున్ హంసయో
షిద్యాధార్త్య ధురీణ వా గుపనిషత్సిద్ధాంత మార్గానుసా
రోద్య ప్రజ్ఞను బల్మియుఁ మననసంయుక్తంబు గావించుచున్
హృద్యంబై యది యంతకంత కలర్ నిల్పం గడుం జిత్తమున్[275]

Because this verse occurs in the context of medittaion on an object previously described, it appears to be a refernce to Kashmir *Saivism,* but in fact it cannot be . If the poet was really in favour of this school, he would have certainly suggested the implication of this metaphysics on more than one ccoasion. As a matter of fact,he had much scope for it because his Rāghavapāndavīyam, was dedicated to Virūpākkṣa and his Prabhāvatīpradyumnam to his father, who was a devotee of Siva. But such references are completely lacking, and hence, it connot be said that the poet was in sysmpathy with kashmir *Saivism.*

224 What does the foreging survey reveal? There is not even a scintilla of evidence to prove that the poet was an Advaitin. Secondly even the Rāgahavapāndavīyam and the Prabhavatipradyumnam do not positively say that he was not a Viśṣitādavaitin, whreas his kalāpūrnōdayam as shown in the previous chapter definitely proclaims his leaninigs towards Viśiṣṭādvaita.[276] Given these facts, can any one agree with the critic's judgment that the poet masquareded as a Viśiṣtadvaitin only to please his patron, Nandyāla Kṛṣṇabhūpati?

CHAPTER XI

VIŚIṢṬĀDAVITA AND ITS THEORY OF BEAUTY

As Sūrana is a Viśiṣṭādvaitin,this theory of Art and his comcept of its complete emergence cannot be understood in the correct perspective without knowing the philosophy of Viśistādavita. Threfore, it is necessary to examine the fundamental tenets of this philosophy in so far as it throws light on the nature of Beauty and Art. Viśiṣṭādvaita which is wrongly interpreted as qualified monism is in fact, a philosophy of monistic pluralism. If one is to present its epistemology in the language of the lay man without invloving oneself in its technicalities, it may run as follows:-

I preceive a sheet of paper,white,soft and smooth. This perception of mine consists of three factors,the agent that is perceiving, the object that is being perceived and the perception itself. Now what are the relationships between these three factors? The sheet of paper which is the object in the present case can be said to be either a creation of my mind.or an object exsisting independently of my mind. If the former is valid, I can know only a universe which is filled with entities of my own mind. This means that objects as such do not exist independently of our minds, that all of them are produced by individual minds, that there are as many universes as there are minds without anything common between them, and that there connot be common values or intercommunication between the various minds. As these things are contradicted by experience, and as this theory cuts at the very root of enquiry, this cannot be accepted. Moreover, this theory starts with the presupposition that our minds do not exist and this is a self-contradiction, simple and pure.

The second theory that objects do exist independent of our minds may be once again divided into three classes:- The first maintains that the objects are not known as they are in themselves but only as they are presented by our minds. The second

only as they are presented by our minds. The second theory upholds that the objects are essentially of one and the same nature,that they appear to be differnt and manifold due to the superimposition of Avidya and that their maniflodness and variety is neither is nor is not,nor both and thus indefinable. The third theory argues that the objects are real and manifold, and that they are revealed to us through the function or *vrtti* of the mind.

The first cannot be accepted because firstly,it presents two worlds,one knowable and the other unknowable,and secondly,the unknowable will be the cause of the knowable. The second theory that the objects are the result of superimposition of Avidya is refuted on seven grounds. They are firstly, *āśrayānūpapatti,* secondly, *tirōdhānānupapatti,* thirdly, *svarūpānupapatti,* fourthly, *anirvacanīyānupapatti,* fifthly *pramāṇānupapatti,* sixthly, *nirvartakānupapatti* and lastly, *nivṛttyanupapatti.* The seat of Avidya should be either the Jīva or Brahman, neither of which is conceivable. It cannot be the jīva as jiva itself is the fictitious creation of Avidya, nor can it be Brahman as Brahman is selfilluminea and can never be enveloped by Avidya. To trace the locus of Avidya to the jīva and that of the jīva to Avidya is to commit the fallacy of mutal dependence.

2. *Brahmasvarūpa* is *jñāna* and self-luminous. Either it is pure consciousness or not.If it is the former,it cannot be obscured, obstructed or destroyed by nescience.
3. Avidya is either real or unreal. If it is an entity or mulasvarupa,then it is inherent in Brahman as *mūlāvidya* and cannot be destroyed.If it is unreal there is no *mūlāvidya* or *tulāvidya* as one or many.
4. Theorising activity is the actual work of thought and to say that there is a theory which is indefinable (*sadasadvilakṣaṇa*) is meaningless.
5. The theory of Avidya is not supported by *sastraic* authority or any other *pramāna.*

6 *Ajnāna* cannot be sublated or dispelled by *jnāna,* as *jnana* is itself the effect of *ajnāna* But if it is something given, it can be removed only by spiritual discipline and not by the mere knowledge of self-identity. If Brahman is ever existent and Avidya a non-existent, then the tern *mumukastava* conveys no meaning at all.

7. Brahmajnāna is not the *jnāna* of Brahman, but it is *jnana* that is Brahman. It is said that *jnāna* stultifies *ajnāna* and than stultifies itself; if so, *jnāna* is an act of spiritual suicide. With the vanishing of Avidya, *jagat* and Īśvara also perish.

This theory of Avidya or Māya, therefore, cannot be accepted.

The third theory that the objects are manifested by the mind through its function or *vṛtti* makes souls and Isvara superfluous and the world process simply mechanical. Such a theory gives no assurance of the eternal bliss or complete release from the cycle of *samsāra* And such a theory, Visistadvaita maintains, cannot be accepted.

It follows from the above examination that objects do exist in their own right. Now what is the relationship between knowledge and its object? Since the object or *prameya* is relatively independent and has its own existence, and since it presupposes knowledge, the latter cannot be either the cause or the effect of the former. The distinction of cause and effect in empirical life is due to mere having the particular anterior state and the particular posterior state. The designation of a new categeory right up to earth takes place when an element attains a different kind of state by abandoning its anterior state.[27] Knowledge, therefore, is as real as the agent who cognises and the object that is cognised. It is neither material nor spiritual but immaterial (*ajada*). By immateriality it is meant that knowledge illumines itself as well as the object for another but never for itself.[278] It is self originated, self-valid[279] and *sui generis.* That consciousness is self-luminous is inferred in the following manner:- "the consciousness, it is disputed, with reference to its own empirical usage, affects some-

thing independently, because it is the case of empirical usage independent of anything in its own class, like an object, or a sense organ or a light. Between sense of sight and light there is no similarity of generic character; for there is distinction between them because of the difference as that of *ahamkāra* and of *tējas* "[280] When it illumines itself, it is unconscious substance,and when it manifests objects,it is of the nature of substance-attribute or *dravyaguna* This statement naturally leads to the quesion: How can one and the same thing be both a substance and a quality at the same time? A substance according to Viśiṣṭādvaita, is the material cause and the material cause is the locus of states. It is the substratum of attributes.[281] Whereas non-substance is that which is devoid of conjunction,[282] consciousness is of the nature of attribute, because it is dependent upon soul like the attributes of a substance. It is also a substance since it undergoes contradiction and expansion. "It need not be doubted how consciousness, an attribute of the individual self, can become a substance because there is no contradiction between one and the same thing being both a substance and an attribute like light. Substance is the abode of states. The extension of consciousness beyond its substrate is possible in the case of light. A syllogism may be framed in the following manner.- Attributive consciousnes is a substance, because it possesses the attributes of diffusion etc. like a lumious substance. And moreover, consciousness is a substance, because it is the cause of cognition (*bhāvana*), being different from the non-substance of conjunction and the unseen effect (*adṛṣta*) like an individual self."[283]

When such is the nature of knowledge it cannot be momentary or cannot be considered as existing for three moments as Buddhists advocate. Nor is it illusory in empirical life and in the phenomenal as maintained by the Advaitin; nor is it extrinsically valid as postulated by the followers of Nyaya and Vaisesika, nor consciousness itself is the self as asserted by the follwers of Sāṅkhya and yōga. Thus "*jñāna, mati, prajña, samvit, dhisana, dhi, manīṣa, sēmuṣi, mēdha, buddhi*" and such other terms are

.synonyms of consciousness. Consciousness itself owing to the differnce of the limting adjunct, takes the form of happiness, sorrow, desire, hate, endeavour, etc. There is no evidence for the assumption of consciousness as distinct from and as a cause for generating happiness etc. The empirical usage 'I desire', 'I hate', is accounted as an attribute of consciousness like 'I remember' which is also a different form of consciousness.

"when it is said that desire, resolve, doubt, faith, want of faith, firmness, want of firmness, modest, intelligence, fear and all these are but the mind, it is not really so. Because mind is the associate of consciousness, it is figuratively said that mind is all.

"similarly, perception, inference, verbal testimony, recollection. doubt, misapprehension, error, discrimination, effort, infatuation, attachmet, hate, insobriety envy, courage, fickleness, arrogance, covetousness, anger, pride, stupefaction, treachery, persistence, disgust,joy, etc. and good state of mind, bad state of mind, affection, contentment, exaltation, peace, non-attachment, enjoyment, friendship, compassion, desire, for liberation, modesty, forbearance, enquiry, desire for victory, delight, forgiveness, desire for art aversion, reminisœent forgiveness, desire for art, aversoion, reminiscent impression, hypocrisy, detraction of the qualities of others, desire to kill, inordinate hankering, cupidity, past impression, dicussion, faith, devotion to God, self-surrender to God, etc. are the attributes of the individual self and they are innumerable, they are but particular modes of the attributive consciousness"[284]

Since objects are real and have independent existence,and since knowledge manifests or reveals itself as well as the object, our thoughts and experiences are trustworthy. The subject of cognition is as real as cognition and cognitive act. Real objects independent of the mind and corresponding to their contents, are alone known. Therefore, reality of objects is reckoned as absolute. This view is known as *satkhyāti*, since what exists is cognized.[285] If what exists alone is cognized, how can one explain illusion, error, opinion, dream etc. which are quite different from

valid knowldge? In the case of mistaking a rope for a snake,it is as real as the cognition of a rope itself. But the differnce between the two lies in this, the former consists in invalidating the workabilty of an object (విషయవ్యవహారబాధాత్) whereas the latter leads to successful activity. Now it may be questioned how one and the same subject can have two different cognitions when it comes into contact withe one and the same object? This is explained by Viśsitādvaita on the basis of quintuplication or *pañcikarana*. "By the process of quintuplication, all the elements are present in all the elements like earth etc. Therefore, owing to the presence of a small portion of silver nacre, the object of that consciousness (i.e silver) is true. But as the portion of silver-content in the nacre is infinitesimal, it cannot serve the purpose of practical life; hence that cognition is *bhrama*. It disappears because of the knowledge of the preponderance of the nacre content in the object".

"The cognition of dream etc. is also real. From the *Sruti* we understand that the Supreme person creates chariots etc. subsisting for a certain time only,for the expericence of the particular individual self in accordance with its spiritual merit and demerit."[288]

"In the case of the cognition, the conch is yellow, the explanation is as follows:- The visual rays of the eye which are in contact with the bile of the eye enter into conjunction with the conch; then the whiteness belonging to the conch is over-powered by the yellowness of the bile and hence not cognized. Therefore arises the cognition', the conch is yellow like a gold-gilt conch. The yellownesss issuing from his eye, owing to this extreme subtlety,is apprehended by him alone and not by others."[289]

From the above explanation it follows that knowledge is always of the real. But what differentiates valid knowledge (*anyathajñāna,*) and contrary knowledge (*viparīta-jñāna*)is this:- the former reveals or manifests the object as it really is and serves practical need whereas the latter do not.[290] The sources of such valid knowledge according to Vsistadvaita are only three: perception, inference and verbal or scriptural testimony. Perception

or pratyakṣa is the instrument of valid and immediate knowledge.[291] It has for its object something always characterised by difference, as it is impossible to perceive anything without any difference. Even if some one says that a state of consciousness without any differnence is possible, such a determination is always marked by some attribute or other.

Perception is of two kinds, determinate and indeterminate. Indeterminate perception does not mean the apprehension of an object bereft of all distinctions. For, whatever enters into human experience under any circumstances appears with some elemnets of spatial and structural relations. Even the perception of an object for the first time involves thinking and discrimination as 'this'or 'that'. Viśiṣṭādvaita, recognising the necessity of conceptual factors in any experience, defines indeterminate perception as the cognition of an individual for the first time with attributes, configuration etc. When the object of the same class is perceived for the second or the third time with the notion of its generic character, the perception is called determinate

"The mode of perception is as follows:- Atman is joined with the mind, mind with the sense organ and the sense organ with the object of knowledge; as a rule,the sense organs do their function by coming into contact with the object to be cognized (ఇంద్రియాణాం ప్రాప్య ప్రకాశకారిత్వ నియమాత్). Therefore,when the visual sense is in contact with an object, in the form of a jar etc., ocular knowledge arises in the form 'this is a jar'.[292]

According to Viśiṣṭādvaita *yōgic* perception is not an independent source of knowledge. *Smṛti* or recollection, pratyabhijña or recognition, *abhava* or non-existence, conjecture or *uha*, doubt or *samśaya* and genius or pratibha of holy personages are included in perception. The reason for this according to Srinivāsadāsa, the author of Yatīndra Matadīpika, is as follows:- "Even if recollection is admitted as *pramāna*, it has to depend on reminiscent impressions (*samskāra*); since perception is the origin of recollection, it is brought under perception, and so there is

no need to regard it as a separate *pramana*.[293] Just as recollection is included in *pratyakṣa*, recognition (*pratyabhijna*) also in the form of 'this is that Dēvadatta' is included in perception. In our system since non-existence is nothing but another form of existence, the knowledge of non-existence of the jar is the floor itself. The antecedent non-existence of the jar is clay itself. The destruction of the jar means pot sherds."[294]

The scound? source of knowledge which is inference proceeds from the knowledge or pervasion (*vyapti*) between the pervaded (*vyāpya*)and the pervader(*vyāpaka*). In a case where fire pervades smoke, fire is called the pervader and smoke the pervaded. When there is cognition that smoke is pervaded by fire, the knowledge of the pervader, namely,fire is obtained as in the inference,"wherever there is somke there is fire" To ascertain the relations of pervasion between two phenomena, a single observation is not sufficient. Therefore Viśiṣtādvaits emphasises the need for repeated observation to establish the universal pervasion beyond doubt. The syllogism is not restricted to five members only. In som cases three-membered sysllogism serves the purpose,and in other cases even two-membered syllogism is recognised as sufficient.[295] Viśistdāvaita includes analogy (*upamāna*) and presumption (*arthāpatti*) in inference. "Analogy is the knowledge of a figure qualified by co-similarity which is accomplished by the recollection of the meaning of an assimilative statement (*atidesavakya*). A person though ignorant of the meaning of the word gavaya, hears from a forester that gavaya is similar to a cow; he goes to a forest and remembers the meaning conveyed by the assimilative statement. When he sees the figure qualified by co-similarity,then there arises in him the knowledge of the figure qualified by co-similatity, accompanied by the recollection of the meaning of the assimilative statement heard before. That knowledge is said to be anaolgy or *upamāna* This is included in perception, since it is of the nature of recollection. It is brought under inference, as it depends upon the cognition of pervasion. And it is included in verbal testimony also, since it is generated by sentence.[296]

Visistadavita along with Nyāya, Sankhya and other Schools refuses to recognise presumption as a separate means of knowledge, since its purpose is served by inference. For instance, in the syllogism "Devadatta eats at night, because he is fat without eating by day," "eating" is the pervasive concomitant of fatness," since whenever fatness is seen, there must be eating also. As it is known that Dēvadatta does not eat by day, the inference is that he must eat at night.

The third source of knowledge is *sabda* or verbal or scriptural testimony. The highest reality which is the sole cause of the univere is Ramanuja maintains, not the object of perception or inference, but is known only through the *sāstrās* [297] *Brahman* is not an object of perception.[298] No generalisation from experience can prove or disprove the reality of *Brahman.*[299] Its reality, to which intelligenc points, lies in a region beyond that which intelligence points, lies in a region beyond that which can be actually observed or understood by finite intelligence. Scripture, this theory maintains, is the only source regarding supersensuous matters, though reason may be employed in support of scripture. A statement is authoritative when it is uttered by a trustworthy person, when it is free from errors due to defects of sense organs or when its meaning is not contradicted by any other cognition. The two sections of the vedas, namely, *Karmakanda* and *jnanakanda,* do not contradict each other. The earlier section or the Karmakanda treats of the various modes of *upasana* or worship and the latter is devoted to *Brahman,* the object of worship. Hence both the Kandas of the Vēdas constitute one homogeneous subject. Unlike the *Mimamsa* school where validity of verbal statement is restricted to those Vedic texts which have for their scope what is yet to be accomplished (*sadhya*), in Visstadvaita the Vedic texts which denote Brahamn as existent reality(siddha), are also of equal authority. The *pancaratragama* and the *Vaikhanasagama,* which do not contradict the Vedas are authoritative *in toto* according to this system.

All statements, whether Vedic or secular, are of two kinds, one having primary denotative funcion, and the other having scondary denotative function (*gaunavrtti*). Primary denotation is *abhidhavrtti*, and it is manifold because of such differences as *yōga. rudhi* etc. When the meaning indicated by the primary denotation is stultified the meaning nearest to it is denoted and that denotation is the secondary one . It is of two kinds, *laksana* and *gauni*. Just as all words denoting "body" have their final meaning in the owner of the body, so also all words, whether they denote spirit such as *Brahma, rudra, Agni, indra* etc. Who constitute the body of Bhagavan, or matter such as *prakrti, kala, akasa, prana* etc, which constiture His body, have their final meaning in the owner of the body, Srī *Narayana*, the Supreme self.

All knowledge, whether perceptual or inferential, or of verbal testimony, manifests objects as having at least one quality apart from the quality of pure being. When I perceive a leaf, I perceive its colour, shape, structure (*samsthāna*) etc. but not its simple and pure being. It is the same in case of inference and verbal testmony also . Even scriptual testimony which says that *Brahman* is devoid of qualites means only that He is devoid of bad qualites. He is not pure consciousness bereft of all qualites. Since knowledge reveals what is existing and real, the qualities we apperhend must have a locus . If it is not the reality,the objects manifested by our knowledge,what can be the substratum of these qualities? Therefore, there is not and there cannot be even a single object or thing without a quality. Everything transcendent or immanent must have some quality or other.

PRAMEYA

The object of valid knowledge is diveded into two main categories as substance(*dravya*) and non-substance(*adravya*). Substance is not only the meterial cause but also serves as the locus of changes. There are six substances - *prakrti, kala, dharmabhutajnana, nityvibhuti, jiva* and *Isvara*. Non-substance which is an attribute, is always dependent on substance. While non-substance

as an attribute is subject to change,the substance as the substantive element does not undergo any change. A characteristic feature of Visistādvaita is that non-substance is sometimes viewed as both substance and attribute. For instance, though light (*prabha*) is an attribute of a effulgent object, it serves also as a substace, since it is subject to contraction and diffusion, and possesses colour as an attribute. From the absolute standpoint *Isvara* is the Substance,and the world of matter and selves are His attributes. *Īśvara* and *jīva* viewed as substantive elements, are not subject to modifications, while *prakrti, kāla, dharmabūta-jnana* and *nityavibhūti* as *attributive* elements undergo change.

The non-substances are ten in number. *Sattva, rajas* and *tamas* are the qualites of *prakṛti* Sound, touch, colour, taste and smell are qualities of prakrti. Sound,touch,colour,taste and smell are the qualites of the five elements (*bhūtās*) like *ākāsa* etc. Conjuncion or *samyōga* is the external relation between substances. *Sakti* or potency is the effecting agent of causation in all causal substances.

PRAKRTI AND KĀḶA

Prakṛti, characterised by the three gunas, constitutes the stuff out of which the universe evolves. It is the abode of individual self in mundane existence. It is called *mūlaprakṛti* since it is the primordial cause of the cosmos. It is known as *"ākaśa"* as it is eternal in spite of its manifold changes and modifications. It is termed as *avyakata*, as it is very subtle in its causal state. It is called *avidya* as it is opposed to the knowledge of Reality, and is known as *māya, as* it is the cause of cosmic wonders.

When matter is in an extremely latent state Without distinction of name and form, it is known as *praḷaya*. From *prakrti*, known as *tamas* in the beginning of evoluton, *mahat* appears with the three states of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas Mahat* evolves into *ahamkāra* with the same three states called *sāttvikāhāmkāra (vaikārika), rajasāhāmkāra (taijasa)* and *tamasāhamkāra, (Bhutadi)* From *sāttvikāhamkāra*, aided by *rajasāhamkāra*, proceed the

eleven senses, five conative senses, five congnitive senses and mind or manas. "Manas is that sense organ which is the cause of memoty etc. It resides in the region of the heart and is denoted by such terms as *buddhi*, *ahamkāra*, *citta* etc., it is the cause of bondage as well as deliverance.[300] It is not only the inner sense organ through which consciousness flows to the senses but also the sense commune which receives and co-ordinates sense knowledge. It is called *buddhi* when it is engaged in the function of deciding (*adhyavasāya*); *ahamkāra* or *abhimāna* when it conceives wrongly-for instance when the *atman* is identified with the body-and *citta* when it thinks. " These *indriyas* are subtle. They follow the individual self in its entry into other bodies and other worlds etc. In the state of liberation as they are unable to follow the individual self to the transcendental realm,they stay here till the time of dissolution. Or, they are taken by others who are devoid of such organs. The view that the conative senses are destroyed along with the *conative* senses destroyed along with the destruction of the body should be abandoned as it is opposed to the Sribhasya and other works."[301]

From *tamasāhamkara*, aided by *rājasāhamkāra*, arise the five gross elements of akasa etc. through the media of the five tanmatras of sound, touch, colour, taste and odour.

The entire process of cosmic evolution is noting but change of states, The distinction between cause and effect is not real. A particular anterior state is called the cause and a particular posterior state is called the effect. Every effect connotes a pre-existing cause. The doctrine of *sātkāryavāda* affirms the non-differnece of cause and effect.

Kāla or time is eternal and all pervasive. Unlike *prakriti*, it is devoid of the three *gunas* of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* Time as effect,which we experience in our ordinary life,is changing and non-eternal. Months and years according to human and divine standards, the four *yugās*, the birth of Manus etc. and *nitya*, *naimittika* and *prakrta* dissolutions are dependent on time. It serves

as an instrument in the cosmic functions of *Isvara*. Though time has independence in the *līlāvibhuti* (playmanifestation), it has no independent status in the *nityavibhuti* (eternal-manifestation.)

NITYAVIBHUTI

Nityavibhūti is the immaterial, infinite domain beyond *prakrti* and its three *gunas*. It is selfluminous and is characterised by what is known as suddhatattva, different from the *sattva* of the three *gunas*. It is known by the differnet names of *paramapada, tripadvibhuti, anandalōka* etc. *Vaikuntha*, the city of God, is situated within the realm of *nityavibhuti*. It is the stuff out of which the bodies of *Isvara*, the eternal, and the liberated selves are made. It is the means for the enjoyment of the liberated selves. The five *saktis* of *sarva, nivṛtti, visva, puruṣa* and *paramēṣthin* and the six attributes of *jnana, sakti, bala, aisvarya, virya, tejas* manifest themselves in this eternal domain of *suddhasattva*. Though it is beyond *prakṛti* it is capable of descending and permeating the consecrated images (arcavataras) in sacred pleaces.

DHARMABHUTAJNANA

The nature of *Dharmabhutajnana* or attributive knowledge has already been discussed. It is eternal and all -pervasive in respect of *Isvara* and *jivas*. It embraces the paths of *karma, jnana* and *bhakti*, and constitutes the root of religious experience. Finally, when the religious experience develops into firm meditation which is compared to the uninterrupted flow of oil, it becomes the means of realising the beatific form of the Divine. Thus the religious consummation is absolutely dependent on the perfect manifestation of *dharmabhūtajnana*.

"*Karmayoga, jnanayoga* and other *yogas*, which are said to be the means for liberation, are the means to *mokṣa* through the medium of *Bhakti* alone What is called *karmayōga* is a special kind of activity which a person possessing true knowledge of the individual self and the Highest received from the instructions of

the preceptor, performs according to his capacity, it is non-prohibited action without any regard for the fruits, and is in the shape of *kamya, nitya* and *naimittika* actions. It is divided into worship of God penance, pilgrimage, charity, sacrifice, etc. this by destoying the impurites of the individual self, generetes *jnana*, and through it or directly becomes the producer of *bhakti* What is called *jnanayoga* is a special kind of meditation on the real nature of one's own self as distinct from *prakrti* and as existing for the purpose of *Isvara*, after having attained purity of mind by the discipline of *karmayoga* This is useful for the direct realisation of *bhakti*. Likewise the manner in which other means also are useful for generationg bhakti may be understood. *Bhaktiyoga* is a continuous stream of remembrance, of God, uninterrupted like the flow of oil, and is characterised by the eightfold limits of *yama, niyama, asana, pranayama, pratyahara, dharma* and *samādhi* It is generated by the sevenfold discipline of *vivēka* (discrimination), *vimoka* (detachment), *abhyasa* (constant practice), *kriya* (good action), *kalyana* (virtuous conduct) *anavasāda* (cheerfulness and *anuddharasa* (non-exultaion) [302]

Bhaktiyoga is the classical pathway to liberation. But there is an alternative path to release for those who find it difficult to practise the austere disciplines of *sādhana-saptaka* and *aṣṭānga yōga*, and who are not qualifed to receive instuction in the Vēdas and the Upanisads. This may be follwed by anyone irrespective of his or her limitaitons, physical, mental or social. This is known as *prapatti* The heart of *prapatti* is absolute self-surrender with the firm faith in the saving grace of *Isvara* The main characteristics of *prapatti* are "to conceive what is in conformity with the will of God, to reject what is disagreeable to Him, to have firm faith that He will save, to seek Him alone as the protector and to surrender one's self to Him in all meekness. A single act of self-surrender in all sincerity is sufficient to bring about release at once."

JIVAS

Since knowledge as pointed out is self-originated, *sui generis* and eternal, the substratum of knowledge, *jiva* or individual self, must be of same nature. Like *Īśvara* it has the characteristics of self-consciousness, sentiency, self-hood, agency etc. "What is called self-consciousness is to illumine oneself. Sentiency consists in being the locus of consciousness. Self-hood consists in having invariable relation with the body. Agency consists in being the locus of volitional consciousness.[303] it is monadic (*anu*) in size and has consciousness for its attribute. It is subsidiary (*sesa*) by nature to *Brahman*, the principle (*sēsin*). Different as it is from the body, sense organs, mind, vital breath etc., it is eternal. When it is said that an individual soul is born and it is dead, it means that jiva has taken newly a gross body and that it has been severed form it. It is different in each body. "Although the souls, as biging parts of *Brahaman* and so on,are of essentially the same character, they are actully separate;for each of them is of atomic aize and resides in a separate body. For this reason there is no confusion or mixing up of the individual spheres of enjoyment and existence."[304] By nature it is blissful, but it is caught in the wheel of *samsāra* due to its *avidya karmas* accumulated by it in its previous births.[305] Not only it is the agent but also the enjoyer. From the point of view of matter or *prakrti* it is the body. It is not only sentient but also of the essence of *ananda* In the state of bondage *jnana* and *ananda* are obscured, but in the state of release they fully manifest themselves.

When such is the nature of *Jiva*, it refutes the theories of Buddhists, Cārvakas, Jainas, Sānkhyas, Yādavaprakāsa, Bhāskara and Advaitins, whether they are "*ēkajivavādins*" or *anēkajivavadins*"[306]

The Jivas, which are innumerable, are of three classes the eternals, the liberated and the bound. The eternals are those who are never caught in the *samsara*, and who have from eternity been enjoying *ananda* in Vaikunta. The liberated are those who have attained liberation through *bhakti* and *prapatti*. The bound

are those who are not liberated from *samsara* due to *avidya* and *karma*. At the moment of giving up the body, the *jiva* which has attained the knowledge of *Brahman* issues out of the body through the aperture in the crown of the head and moves upwards through the ray of the Sun. The released self ultimately reaches its superme goal and enjoys *ānanda* for ever being established in the communion whith God. *Mōkṣa* is essentally of the nature of *Sāyujya* (communion) and not *sālōka* (co-existence), *sārūpya* (similarity) or *samipya* (intimacy) or *svarupaikya* (identity with Him).[307] Each employed in his special duty will attend upon the Supreme Self. The power of the liberated soul is devoid of cosmic functions. He can assume manifold forms and wander all over the worlds.

ĪŚVARA

Īśvara is the controller and the principal (*śeṣin*) of all; He is the bestower of all fruits,the sustainer of all and the supreme cause of all effects. He is the ultimate object of every act of worship. The material universe and all the innumerable souls form His body and draw their sustenance from Him. If *Īśvara* is the whole matter and soul are its parts; if He is the substance, they are the qualites; if He is the soul,they are the body. Both *"cit"* and *"acit"* have a meaning and value only in Him but not apart from Him. The universe depents on God as its ground, its *ratio* essendi but not as its cause.

"Since consciousness presupposes a consicious self,the Reality is not identical with consciousness. Hence *Isvara* is not pure non-differenced being, nor pure consciousness,but the highest self, characterised essentially by consciousness and unsupassable *ānanda*. He is the sole cause of the universe since he comprehends it within Himself in latent from prior to creation, and then by His will manifests what is latent.

"The conception of God as the Supreme person and creator raises the following question. How can the Supreme Being be eternally perfect if he manifests Himself as the world? Will not the imperfections of the world adhere to the perfect Being also?

Rāmānuja meets this question when he says: "According to our view, *Brahman* has for its body all sentient and non-sentient beings in the subtle and in the gross state. In the effected as well as in the causal condition, it is free from all shades of imperfection, and is an infinity of perfections. All imperfections and sufferings and all changes belong not ot *Brahman* but only to the sentient and non-sentient beings which are its modes."[308] This clearly shows that Viśiṣṭādvaita attempts to solve this problem by its doctrine that the relation between body and soul. It is the doctrine of *sarira-sarin sambandha. Brahman* has the individual soul and matter for his body while he is the universal Self of that body. The world-body has two states, the causal and the effected, the nature of which are contracion and expansion. These states belong to the world-body alone and not *Brahman* Himself. Expansion is evolution and contracion is involution. *Brahman* becomes or manifests the world in the sense that he evolves the body which is his attribute. Not that the essence of Reality is in a state of flux. The notion of a Supreme person,whose áttribute only is in a state of mainfestation, makes the divine Being,the substantive element, the ground of all existence. The entire process of evolution in the from in which *Isvara* manifests himself in and through the world-body is an opportunity given to *jivas* to attain a life of perfection and communion with the Supreme. "Just as the imperfections of child-hood, youth, etc. adhere to the body only and to the embodied soul, so also the imperfectionts of the "cit" and *"acit"* do not extend to the highest Self who has the sentient and the non-sentient as His body."[309]

Granting that the Viśiṣṭādvataitin's conception of substance, quality and time is logical and valid,it naturally follws that the imperfections and changes to be found in the case of matter and selves do not affect the Absolute, that *Brahman* is beyond change and that He is both transcendental and immanent. Thus this theory of Viśiṣṭādvaita refutes the views of the followers of atheism, Sānkhya and *Mimāmsa*. "Since natural causaltity is admitted,the theories of the followers of the schools of *Yōga*,

pasupata and *Nyaya* are refuted, for *Isvara* is admitted by them with reference to efficient causality only. Just as in respect of the effect (i.e.cration), Isvara is the material and the efficecnt cause,so also it is possible for him to become the agent, the impeller, the controller, the revealer, the helper, the unconcerned etc."[310]

"And *Iśvara* is essentially of the nature of all pervasiveness (*vibhu*) which is of three kinds. Pervasiveness by His essential nature, by the attributive consciousness, and by His body. And he, it is said, is infinite. What is called infinite is to be free from the three kinds of limitations-limitations of space, time and object.

"Truth,consciousness, bliss, purity, etc., are the attributes which determine the essential nature of *Isvara* Knowledge, power, etc., are the attribbutes of the essential nature so determined Omniscience, omnipotence, etc., are the attributes which are useful for the act of creation. Love , excellence of disposition, easiness of attainment, etc. are attributes which are usefull for providing refuge (to the devotees). Compassion and others are the attributes which are useful for the protection (of the good) [311] *Iśvara* is the creator, the protector and the destroyer of the universe. He abides in a fivefold form as *para, uyūha, vibhava, antaryāmin* and *archavatāra* "What is called *para* is Nārāyana, who is expressed by such terms as *parabrahman, Parāvāsudēva,* who is qualified by the infinite, auspicious attributes such as knowledge, power etc., whose presence is being enjoyed by the eternals such as Ananta, Garuda, Visvaksena, etc and other Sama-singing liberated selves who is the possessor of a divine, auspicious figure who is four-armed, who is accompanied by Sri Bhu and Nila, who is equipped with the divine weapons such as conch discuss, etc. who is adorned with divine ornaments such as a crown, etc., who is seated on *Sēsa* who is upon the throne composed of eight legs such as *dharma,* etc., in the *mahamanimandapa* with in the divine abode, attended by the gate-keepers such as Canda, Pracanda, Bhadra, Subhadra, Jaya, Vijaya, Dhatr Vidhatr, etc. in the divine city called Vaikuntha,

within Tripadvibhūti, protected by the city guards such as Kumuda, Kumudaksa, Sumukha, Supratisthita, etc who are equipped with the divine weapons, ornaments, attendants and other paraphernalia."

"What is called *Vyūha* is the highest *Brahman* himself abiding in a fourfold form as Vasudēva, Samkarsana, pradyumna and Aniruddha for purposes of mediation (by the devotees) and for creation of the universe."[313]

"*Vibhāva* is the descent of *Īśvara* among beings by means of forms similar to genus. It is of ten kinds; they are those particular *avatārās* such as Matsya etc.[314] The cause for incarnation is nothing but *Īśvara's* own will He is above and beyond *karmās* The object of such incarnations is protection of the good and destrucion of the wicked.

"*Antaryāmin* is that form of *Īśvara* which abides in the region of the heart which stays with the individual self as its friend, in its states of experience, such as heaven, hell, etc and which is perceptible to the *yōgins* Though He in the form of *Antaryāmin* co-exists with the individual self, He is untouched by the taints inherent in it, i.e. the individual self[315]

"What is called *Arcāvatara* is that special form which remoteness of space and time accepts for its body any substance chosen by the devotees, and descends into it with a non-meterial body, He becomes dependent on the worshipper for bath, food, sitting, sleeping etc. He bears everything and is replete with knowledge and other attributes. He is present in houses, villages, towns, sacred places, hills, etc.[316]

NATURE OF BEAUTY

With the preceding analysis in view one can now roughly formulate the principles underlining Beauty as conceived by Visistadvaita. It is not, as Plato conceived, an Idea or Universal of which the beautiful things in the world of time and space are only fleeting copies of ephemeral value. Nor is it ,as Aristotle as-

serts, a Form which faces resistance from Matter as a consequence of which we have beautiful things of various grades and degrees. Nor is it, a judgment, as Kant argues, mediating between the activity of Pure Reason and that of Practical Reason. Nor is it a sensuous idea, as Hegel advocates, progressing through the oppoistes only to merge itself in Religion and finally to be lost completely in the sands of philosophy. It is not an object of inference and there by mediate as Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika claim to be. It is not a characteristic of *puruṣa* which is pure consciousness as Sānkhya maintains. Much less is it the Absolute of Advaita which is in fact abstract and which makes the world of ours an illusion and life a meaningless drudgery.[318]

If Beauty is not a Universal, a Form, an Idea, a Judgment, a characteristic, then it must be substance or relation. This is not so, Visistadavaitin asserts, because it is a quality of the Absolute. Since Beauty is a form or mode of knowledge, and since knowledge is essentially of the nature of attributive consciousness, it is purely a quality–a quality of the Absolute, Brahman. It is already seen that the real ground of the universe is changeless, eternal, infinite, having truth, goodness, *ānanda* etc. as its essential qualites. The logical corollary is that Beauty, the quality of the Absolute is also if changeless, eternal and inifinite." As *Brahman* is the identical subject of all specific meditations, the contemplation of one essential quality comprises other qualites as well."[319] Beauty, therefore, comprises truth, goodness, knowledge, *ananda*, etc. As *Brahman* is not and cannot be the object of perception, recollection, recognition, inference, analogy and presumption,[320] Beauty as its quality is also of the same nature. Neither can it be known through negation. The individual self can experience it through intuition or vision which is immediate and which gives infinite bliss "As a man embraced by his beloved wife knows nothig that is without and nothing that is within, so this self when embraced by the intelligent *prajna* or self knows nothing that is without and nothing that is within."[321] Such is the state of the soul when it intuits Beauty.

Since Beauty is changeless, eternal and absolute, it does not evolve, nor does it admit of divisions, or grades amd degrees. It is universal having noting to do with personal prejudices and predilections. Its intuition does not change from society to society. Neither time and space nor customs and habits can tell upon Beauty. The poet speaks nothing but truth when he says, "A thing of Beauty is ajoy for ever." That is why works of art produced in distant times and different climes are being appreciated and enjoyed even to this day. Changes in circumstances, ideas and ideologies are not able to bring destruction upon them. Because Beauty is infinite, any number of expressions, forms and manifestations cannot exhaust it, something more stands over and above all the myriads and myriads of forms that have come and that are yet to come.

As *Brahman* is not dependent upon others such as souls and matter but others depend on it for their very existence and sustenance and as it is selfevident, so also Beauty as its quality is not dependent on minds conceiving or intuiting it and it is self evident. That means, Beauty is independent of mind and souls; their success or failure to grasp it can neither prove nor disprove its existence. Just as light shines by itself and does not require any thing to show it, so also Beauty shines by itself and does not stand in need of some other thing to reveal it. Just as judgment consists of subject and predicate and denotes a single unity of sense, so also *Brahman* has sentients and non-sentients as his body and they denote and have meaning in the unity, *Brahman.* In the same manner, Beauty, the quality of the Absolute comprises unity in diestincts or variety. From this it follows that Beauty never manifests itself through simple colour, word, note, moment, etc., devoid of unity in veriety. That means, intuition of Beauty is always a whole having distinct and finite parts which entirely depend and exist on account of the whole. The latter live in and for the whole. When parts happen to dominate the whole, or the whole depends on the parts, it may be anything but Beauty. That is the reason why Beauty is not an object of perception or inference it is mainly and purely an object of intuition or revelation.

Brahman is the real of the real and the light of the lights And reality is determinate(saviśēsa)and not indeterminate or *nirvisesa*. Truth, knowledge, infinity, will, that in unsullied by *kāma* (or desire), etc. are qualities. Because He has the will divine He creates the world out of Himself and reabsorbs it in Himself purely out of sport or *līla*. Just as a tortoise puts out of its limbs and withdraws them once again into its own shell, and just as the spider spins out fine thread in various forms and winds up,so also the Absolute in sheer joy of self-expression creates out of Himself the world of *nāmarūpa* without Himself undergoing any change in the least and then reabsorbs it once again. This activity is not due to any avidya or karma but due to His own free will Just as the spontaneous self-expression of the artist is though a result of recreation or sport,enwraps the critic or sahrdaya in bliss and enlightens him,so also His creation helps the souls which are sullied by *avidya* and *karma* to get themselves purified. Thus the Absolute which is both immanent and transcendental abides in five forms, the transcendental or *para*, the infinite or *vyūha*, the incarnational or *vibhāva*, the immanent or *antaryāmin*, the idol or arcavatara. As Beaty is a quality of *Brahman*, it manifests itself in this five-fold form. "What is called *para* is Nārāyana who is expressed by such terms as *Parabhahman, Paravāsudēva*"[322] *Vyūha* is the highest *Brahman*, Himself abiding in fourfold form as Vāsudēva, Sankarasana, pradyumna and aniruddha for purposes of meditation by devotees and for the creations of the Universe."[323] "Vibhāva is the descent of Īśvara among beings by means of forms similar to that genus. It is of ten kinds;they are those particular incarnations such as Matsya, etc"[324] "*Antaryāmin* is that form which abides in the region of the heart, which stays with the individual self as its friend even in its states of experience such as heaven, hell, etc.and which is perceptible to the *yōgins*."[325] "*Arcavātara* is that special from which without remoteness of space and time accepts its body and substance chosen by the devotees and descends into it with a non-natural body."[326]

When the nature of Beauty is conceived to be as stated above, many doubts are sure to arise. If it is absolute, chageless, eternal and infinite, how is it that human experience reveals only

partial minifestations? Why are certain works considered to be beautiful in one age and ugly in another? What is beautiful to one must also be beautiful to all if what is said above is valid, but this is contradicting experience itself. Moreover, *Brahman* is *causa sui* of the universe and everthing depends on him for its very existence and sustenance and Beauty is essentially His quality. The universe is the mode or manifestation of His creative activity and every object in it is pervaded by Him; He lives in the heart of each and every object. If this is true, the universe as well as every object in it must be absolutely beautiful with no scope whatsoever for shades or degrees. But there is so much ugliness, vulgarity, sorrow and pain, and even the beauty one experiences is not altogether stainless. It is only relative, ephemeral and admits division and degrees. This judgment is true and is in no way inconsistent with the theory of Beauty, if one properly understands the metaphysics of Viśiṣṭādvaita.

In the previous section it is seen that individual souls are caught in the wheel of *samsāra* only due to their *avidya* and *karma* acqired in their past birhts and that they in that state are deprived of their all-embracing knowledge This knowledge thus is subject to contraction and expansion. As souls in bondage, our knowledge is not all pervasive and thus it is subject to illusion and error. Because of these limitations we do not see the universe as a whole as the eternal suris do. Hence we find so much ugliness, vulgarity, sorrow and pain in the universe in which they intuit nothing but Beauty, Goodness, Truth, auspicious qualites, etc. This can be more clearly understood if illustrated from the "comedy of Errors." Because Rambha, Nalakūbara, Kalabhāsini and Maṇikandhara have limited knowledge deeply coloured by their passions and emotions they are quite unable to know the situation in which they are caught and thus have undergone terrible agony and unbearable pain, whereas Narada, with his divine insight, is able to experience immense joy out of the ludicrous incident. Hence degrees of Beauty with its imperfections and blemishes on the one hand, and the ugliness of objects

on the other, are the results of avidya and karma of individual souls. And another point to be noted is that all these imperfections and blemishes are real and in no way attributable to the Absoulte.

Though the imperfections and blemishes are due to *avidya* and *karma* of the individual souls, the creation and dissolution which are by nature of Beauty Absolute emerge only from Brahman. Even eternal suris do not have any part in cosmic process They can only assume any number of forms and wander through all the worlds which are the manifestations of Īśvara.[327] All the worlds and all the objects in them, therefore, however imperfect their beauty may be emerge form the Absolute. He is the cause and reason of them, and the imperfections and drawbacks are the results of their *avidya* and *karma* If Brahma is said to be the creator of the universe, Viṣṇu to be the sustainer and Siva to be the destroyer it is only He that does all these things and they are only instruments. Similarly all the works of Art, whatever may be their merits and demerits, are essentially His creations and the individual artists are their authors only in name. Through them He creates, He expresses Himself. and the entire beauty in those works is His manifestation whereas the limitations and drawbacks are entirely those of the individual souls having *avidya* and *karma* to their credit This point cannot be more clearly expressed than by the follwoing line of Potana:-

పలికెడిది భాగవతమఁట!
పలికించెడువాఁడు రామభద్రుండఁట నేఁ
బలికిన భవహర మగునఁట
పలికెద వేఱొండు గాథ పలుకఁగ నేలా [328]

Though the poet is an Advaitin, he has exactly echoed the sentiments of a Visistadvaitin and has given a clear exposition of the standpoint of the latter.

Since creative acivity entirely belongs to Brahman, individual works of Art, whether they are spatial, temporal or ideal, have their ultimate cause in Him only. The individual artist is

merely an instrument in its emergence. Though He is immanent in the heart of each individual soul, everyone is not an artist in the sense that he is the instrument in the emergence of a work of Art. Experience clearly gives us this fact. Only those who have acquired merit and through it the Divine Grace are selected as the instruments of creation. With this grace lacking,no one can produce a work of Beauty however hard he may struggle,frisk and flutter. The emnbodied soul through the process of *karmayoga* and *jnānayōga* enters the state of *bhakti* and in that state he develops in him the power to identify himself with the Absolute. That means, he will be able completely to surrender himself to Brahman when He creates or manifests the work of Art. This work of Art, as it has been already pointed out, will be self-sufficient and self-evident having unity in variety or unity of distincts. It is never unity simple and pure, devoid of distincts or variety as some monists hold.

Just as *Īśvara* cannot be intuited by embodied soul steeped in sin and lust,so also Beauty cannot be intuited by people who are untrained and uncultured, and too much infatuated by egotism. They must receive training, carry on self-culture and become *bhaktās* with all their qualites before they can have an intuition or vision of Beauty. Thus only can they qualify themselves to see Beauty and appreciate it. As long as this is lacking, a work of Art will be a sealed book for them.

In this context it may be doubted how individual souls whch are distinctly different from Brahman can know and appreciate Beauty which is purely a quality of the latter. But this will no longer trouble one if one remembers only that both *jiva* and *Isvara* are of the nature of consciousness and have consciousness as an attribute. And hence it is possible for *Jīva* to intuit the beauty of *Isvara* The nature of *Jīva* being such, no one is completely and for ever debarred from becoming an artist and a *sahrdaya* As a matter of fact, every human being is a potential artist and a critic or *sahṛdya* and to become one in reality,what one has to do is to qualify oneself for it. As *Jīva* has freedom, there is nothing that prevents him from achieving it.

G. V. Krishna Rao

One eminent exponent of Visistadvaita commenting on the nature of the emegence of a work of Art writes:- " The artist in a mood of inspiration catches a glimpse of Beauty or Brahman or *Syāmasundara*, and his work of Art is the out-pouring of his mystic ecstasy. Poetry has the closest affinity to mysic expericet and the poet who has a soul-sight of divine beauty communicates by the magic of his words,his inner vision to the *sahrdays* or responsive minds and induces the same exalted mood in them."[329] This interpretation is more in line with the philosophy of Plato than with that of Viśistādvaita. If the above is true, art is merely an imitation and this is quite foreign to Viśiṣṭādvaitic conceptions of Beauty,soul and cosmology. What happens is,as it has been already ponted out, Brahman manifests Himself through the artist or the poet.

In connection with the discourse on the nature of Jiva, Isvara and liberation, it is pointed out that the ultimate object of the embodied soul caught in the traps of births and deaths, is to exhaust its *avidya* and *karma* acquired in its past births,to reach the Absolute abode of God and to be in eternal communion with him. The released soul then will be in direct contact with the infinite beauty of Brahman and will be experriencing bliss that is complete and infinite. That state, as the author of the Pānduranga-mahatmyam explains, is akin neither to that of a stone nor to that of sound sleep [330] It is pure *ānanda* unsullied and unadulterated. A work of art, either plastic or formal, will reveal to the responsive thrill and makes him crave for it. Thus it gives him a foretaste of the absolute and encourages him to seek the eternal In doing so, it disciplines the warring instincts and desires in man, regulates them and directs them towards Brahman Man has fallen from his eternal abode not because he has passions and desires but simply because he has been unable to control them and put them in proper channels. When he is able to regulate and direct them towards the absolute, he is sure to be released from *samsāra*. The Bhāgavata says:-

కామం, క్రోధం, భయం, స్నేహ మైక్యం సౌహృదమేవచ
నిత్యం హరౌ విదధత: యాంతి తన్మయతాం హి తే [331]

A work of art actually induces the responsive mind to do this, and as such, art is important in life. It has at least as much value as science or philosophy, if not more. Given such value, a work of art true to its grain cannot indulge in sheer moral depravity, obnoxious nihilism and unbearable pessimism. If it does, it ceases to be a work of art. It is invariably the result of *niskāmakarma* on the part of the artist. Neither economic considerations nor political motives should determine its composition or emergence. In that pure spirit of dedication to the Almighty who has bestowed the Vedas on us, it must be composed. In this context it is to be remembered that to follow the rites and commands prescribed by *sastra* is certainly a *niṣkāmakarma*

When such is the nature and value of Art, when it is thus given a utilitarian role to play, hierarchy in the field of Arts must result. Approached from this angle, poetry holds the sceptre among the Arts, spatial, temporal and ideal, because no other Art can claim so much clearity of thought, enlightenment of the soul, width of experience, comparative absence of the limitaion of the medium, and proper discipline of the passions and emotions as poetry does Next comes music which is merely a temporal art And this is followed by painting and then sculptre; architecture and other arts can claim only a position next to sculpture.

The above exposition of the nature of Beauty and Art has nowhere touched the subject of rasa which had been invaribly discussed by almost every Indian writer on *Alamkara Sastra* Has Visistadvaita nothing to say on this subject, or is it completely incompatible with this philosophy? Neither of the two surmises is valid because *rasa* is not in any way antagonistc to Visistadvaita Just as Naiyāyikās, Vaiśesikās, Sānkhyās, Trikavādins and Advaitins have interpreted *rasa sūtra* in the light of their schools,[332] so also Viśiṣṭādvaita can read its own philosphy into it. But before one tries to interpret it in the light of Viśṣṭādvaita, one has to consider the expositions of Abhinavagupta who was a Kāshmiri Saiva of Pratyabhiñna school, and Paṇḍitarāya, an Advaitin, pure and simple.

The aphorism of Bharata on *rasa* in the explanation of which, the battles that were fought in the field of epistemolgy were continued, runs as follows:-

విభావానుభావ వ్యభిచార సంయోగా ద్రసనిష్పత్తిః. [333]

Both Abhınavagupta and Panḍitarāya agree on the points that the words *samyōga* and *niṣpatti* in the above *sūtra* mean suggestion (*dhvani*) and realisation (*prakasa* or *carvana*) respectively but they differ ın accunting for this experience. While the former explains ıt from the standpoint of Realistic Monism, the latter ınterprets it from that of Advaita. Abhinava's theory regarding aesthetic experience, to give in a few words, may be explained thus: Every one of us is born with some innate qualites (*vasanas*) and these remain ın the mind in latent from. When we read a poem or attend the performance of a drama,the *vibhāvās, anubhavās* and *vyabhicāris* there ın get into our mind. The three kinds of *bhāvās* which ın the day-to-day life are of the nature of

causes, effects and associates (*sahacāris*) become ıdeal (*aloukika*) when they are grasped by the mind. This transmutation ıs due to imagination which ıs roused to action by the suggestivity of the presented. Set to work, this ımagination which ıs otherwise called *bhāvana* or *pratibha* unıversalıses the three kinds of bhāvās on the one hand,and deindividualıses the subject or percepient on the other. By this process the *vibhāvās* etc. are cut off from time, space, relationship, ıntent and purpose. The hero. the heroine and their activıtes, when presented by ımagination, lose their partculartıty and direction. Suppose we are reading the Abhijñāna Sākuntala and during that time what we see ın our ımagination is not the particular ındividuals, Dusyanta and Sākuntala. Their individualities disappearing,we see only forms or ıdeas of the non-mundance (*aloukika*) nature. These peculiar entities presented by the ımagination are not of the nature of mundaness (*loukikatva*), error (*mithya*), indescribability (*anirvacya*) and similarity to worldliness. Nor are they of superimposition.[334] By the same process the subject or percepient also becomes deindividualised. He forgets his individuality, his name, position. ego, personal disposition, likes and dislikes,and intents and purposes. His knowledge

becomes unconditioned and it may be said that even the five sheaths of *kāla, vidya, raga, niyati* and *kāla* encasing the soul or Ātman fall back revealing it in its true nature. In this state the subject is neither opposed to or disinterested in the pure forms presented by the imagination. As these pure forms develop and their suggestivity internsifies, the subject which is now the universalised consciousness begins to dentity itself with them. As the process intensifies, the basic mood or *sthāyibhāva* which is being suggested also rises to a higher pitch. Because universalised consciousrtess is pure bliss, and because the four *bhavās, vibhavas, anubhavas, vyabhicaris* and *sthayin* become its qualities due to the process of indentification,the latter are also pure bliss or *ananda.*[335] Even after the complete identification, the object does not disappearaltogether. It is still a unity in duality. This contnuous realisation of universalised consciousness is *vimarsa* and *camatkara, rasana, carvana, nirvrti, pramatruvisranti, svarupavisranti, ananda,* and *paramabhōga* are its synonyms. Such is the aesthetic experience which comes under the second category, *Sakti* of Pratyabhijna school, as distinguished from Parama Siva, its first category.

This exposition of *rasa,* though highly complicated,is more satisfactory than any other theory and completely accords with experience. If there is to be any difference of opinion, it should be purely on grounds of its philosophical implications.

Coming to the interpretation of Panḍitaraya it may be explained as follows:- "When an aesthete reads a beautifull poem of appropriate and sweet (*lalita*) compositon (*sannivēsa*), it evokes ideas in him as a result of his mental activity. These will be in the form of Duṣyanta, Sākuntala etc. Due to the imaginative faculty of the mind these ideas become free from the particularity of Duṣyanta, Sākuntla etc. and become ideal so much so that they can arouse the latent impressions (vasanas) in him. In this state they are called ideal *vibhavas, anubhavas* and *vyabhicaris* which have been already existent in the form of causes, effects and asociates. What happens in the present is they arise afresh hav-

ing this ideality about them. By these three ideal *bhavas* there arises an activity of non-mundane (*aloukika*) nature. The veil that covers the blissful (*ānanda*) aspect of the subject will be removed resulting in the disappearance of its limitedness and other superimposed qualites. The subject now shines in its self-luminosity and blissful nature and at the same time illumines *rati* etc. Which is already existent in a latent from (*vāsana*). This which is being manifested or illumined is *rasa* [336]

This explanation of aesthetic experience,though fitting beautifully into the philosphy of Advaita, is unsatisfactory because it brings down this unique expericence to the level of error. It may be protested that this is blissful,but all the same it is an illusion,a dream. This is clearly admitted by Panditaraya himself when he asys that the *vibhāvās, anubhāvās* and *vyabhicāris* presented by *bhāvana* are not in their nature opposed to horses etc. seen in a dream or the silver on the stage.[337] No one after reading a beautiful poem or after attending the performance of a drama feels that he has a sweet dream or a beautiful illusion.[338] Abhinavagupta has expressed only an undeniable fact when he says:- [339] తత్ర నాట్యంనామ.......... స్వప్న మాయేంద్రజాలాది విలక్షణమ్ "Even Panditaraya's further elucidation that aesthetic experience is similar to that of *savikalpasamādhi.*[340] does not improve the position because the prop or ālambana which the *yōgin* takes for his contemplation is practically insignificant. Can one attribute the same to a work of Art which is the reason of the aesthetic experience? This may be platable to those egoists and solipsists who maintain that the subject is everything and the object a mere nothing or illusion, but not to them that give some value to the object.[341] This review naturally leads us to the approach of Visistadvaita. It is therefore necessary to examine what it has to say on this problem.

As already observed, Viśiṣṭādvaita maintains that every individual object in the space-time world has not only a body and a soul but also the Absoulte which is all-pervading in its heart. It is also to be remembered that mind is the seat of latent impressions, tendencies and memories, and has imaginative faculty or

pratibha in addition. Besides these it has the three qualities of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas*. Due to the attachment of this mind, Atman's knowledge is limited. With these points in view let us see what happens in an acsthetc when he reads a beautiful poem, O.Why it is called O and not X is this, it is an object having body, soul and the Absolute within O The soul S in the aesthte comes into contact with O through its mind M. The object O is real and as such has real power. Due to the suggestive power in O, the imaginative faculty of M is awakended when *sattva* predominates over its two asocates, *rajas* and *tamas* Because *sattva* is of the nature of knowledge, *rajas* of activity and *tamas* of *moha* or inertia M becomes pure and acquires the nature conducive to contemplation. There will be, at this stage, neither motor activity nor inertia or moha. The conditionedness of S is removed with this new development. It sees through M which has become ideal or *aprakrta*. As these ideal *bhāvās* develop, suggest the unity underlying, and reveal Brahman, S will be thrilled; the dominant mood *(sthāyin)* corresponding to the *bhāvās* being latent in M rises to the highest pitch. Because of the presence of Brahman whose very qualities are reality, consciousness and bliss (*ananda*) the manifested sthayin is transmuted into that of *ānanda*. Thus S will be completely filled by Brahman. It rests in Brahman. Such being the nature of aesthetic experience, it is *Bhagavadvisranti* or *paramātmavisrānti* as contrasted with *ātmavisrānti*, or *svarūpavisrānti* and *pramatrvisrānti*. Viśiṣṭāndvaitin agrees with the Kāshmir Saiva when he says that *camatkāra, rasana, nirvrti, paramabhōga* and *ananda* are sysnonyms. Entirely differing with the Advaitin who completely denies the activity of *tadātmya* or identifications, Viśiṣṭādvaitin agrees with the Saiva on this point but says that complete identification resulting in oneness never occurs. The distinctness of the two persists according to the former, whereas it disappears in the final stage according to the latter.

Such, in short, is the nature of *rasa* as can be explained by the Viśiṣtādvaitin. Nevertheless he has as any real aesthete would have,certain reservation in accepting *rasa* as the soul of poetry or work of Art in general.Firstly rasa when defined as the

manifested *sthāyin, bhāva* and their semblance or *abhāsa* etc. does not include vastudhvani and *alamkāradhvani* which are in no way insignificant. As a matter of fact Panditaraya severely criticises Viśvantha's definition[342] that poetry is the sentence having *rasa* as its soul. When Abhinava said that there is no poetry without *rasa*[343] or that all poetry lives by *rasa* alone, he did not rule out *vastudhavani* and *alamkāradhvani* from the province of poetry.[344] *Rasa,* therefore, in its strict sense does not cover the whole province of Beauty.

Secondly,there is difference of opinion regarding the number of *rasas*. Abhinavagupta and others, strictly following the authority of Bharata, maintain that *rasas* are only nine and try to fit devotion (*bhakti*), affection (*vātsalya*) love (*preman*) and others into them by including the latter either under any one of the said rasas or under the *bhāvās*.[345] But this,if one is to speak the truth, is quite arbitrary. To try to explain human experience from certain preconceived instincts (*Vāsanās*) or complexes (*manōmālinyās*) is ignoring the richness and infiniteness of the Mind itself.[346] This is exactly the reason why Gestalt psycholgy along with Behaviourism is now-a-days gaining more ground than purposive psychology and psycho-analysis. The arbitrariness infixing the number of *rasas* is more clearly revealed than anywhere else when Panditaraya gives his ruling:

> భారతాది మునివచనానా మేవ రసభావత్యాది వ్యవస్థాపక త్వేన
> స్వాతంత్ర్యాయోగాత్. అన్యధా పుత్రాదివిషయాయా అపి
> రతే: స్థాయిభావత్వం కుతో న స్యాత్. నస్యాద్వాకుత: శుద్ధ
> భావత్వం జుగుప్సాశోకాదీనాం, ఇత్యఖిలదర్శనవ్యాకులీస్యాత్.
> రసానాం నవత్వగణనాచ మునివచననియం త్రితాభజ్యేత, ఇతి
> యధాశాస్త్రమేవ జ్యాయ:. [347]

Whether this ruling is justified or not,a Visistadvatin who believes in and gives the greatest value to *Bhakti* cannot admit or reconcile himself to the theory which does not concede rasatva to *Bhakti, Dasya, Sakhya* and *Vātsalya.* Because of these two considerations he is neither opposed nor strongly attached to *rasa* theory.

Now to summarise the conception of Beauty according to Visistādvaita, it is the quality of the Absolute and as such universal, changeless and infinite. It is not an object of perception or recollection or recongnition or inference or analogy or presumption. It is a quality of which Jīva can have an intuition or vision which is immediate and which gives infinite bliss, truth, goodness, softness, coolness, sweetness, etc., the co-existing qualities of Brahman. The intuition of one of them, therefore, comprises all the other auspicious qualities. The Absolute being both immanent and transcendental manifests itself in five forms *para, vibhāva, vyūha, antaryāmin and arca.* They are the modes of Īśvara of perfect Beauty. The universe is a result of His sport or *Līla* and also helps to Brahmanise the individual souls steeped in *viśayakama.* Thus Beauty has not only intrinsic value but also utility. Due to this latter valued poetry occupiies the highest position whereas music, painting and other fine arsts come next only in due order. The beauties of nature and the fair forms of human and celestial beings are but partial revelation of the unsurpassed beauty of Brahamn. Reality is essentially beautiful,but the world being steeped in sensuality and sin renders it ugly. Creators and lovers as they are, artists and aesthetes are mainly devotees. The artist is only an instrument selected by God for the creation of a work of Art,and the drawbacks and the blemishes, if there are any, are entirely those of the instrument. Without divine grace no one can become an artist, but all the same cultivation and training are necessary. Theory of *rasa,* though not incompatible, does not cover the whole province of Beauty.

G V. Krishna Rao

CHAPTER XII

SURANAS THEORY OF BEAUTY AND OF ITS EMERGENCE

Before proceeding to enquire into the nature of Beauty as conceived by Surana, it is important to bear one point in mind. Kalāpūrnōdayam is mainly a poem and not a treatise on aesthetics,and hence it deos not deal with the subject directly topic by topic as logic demands, but simply suggests it as dictated by relish or *carvana*. Creation of Beauty thus being the end in view,one should not expect either an elaborate and critical exposition or citattion of past and contemporary theories as in a regular treatise such as Dhvanyālōka, Resagangādhara etc. When such is the case one has to be careful not to miss the various suggestions about Beauty and theory of Art scatterd over the whole length and breadth of the poem, and at the same time every precaution is to be taken so that one may not read one's own thoughts into these suggested ideas. Only to avoid this particular danger, the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Visṣtādvaita and its conception of Beauty are given. So long as these points are kept in view, this enquiry will not be futile.

The first suggestion about theory of Beauty is given to us when Kalabhasini admires Maṇikandhara's poetry in the following terms: "Moonlight is both cool and beautiful but lacks fragrance. Crystals of camphor have coolness, beauty and fragrance, but they do not have softness. All these qualities are to be found in the gentle breezes emanating from the Malayaparvata but they are deficient in one thing .If they have only that sweetness, the words of this poet may be imagined to have equals in them."[348] Here the objects brought in for comparison with the words of the poet are the moonlight, crystals of camphor and the gentle breezes which are all physical objects and which are deficient in one way or other when compared . That means Beauty in poetry is not an object of perception. In this context what are considerd are cool-

ness, [illegible]
and therefore Beauty is only a quality which cannot be grasped by perception. Then this question naturally arises, of which substance is it a quality? Before answering it one has to consider another point also. If the poet thinks Beauty to be a quality, why does he bring in the above and not the ten qualities or *gunas* Does not Daṇḍin in his Kavyadarsa clearly say this?

శ్లేషః ప్రసాదః సమతా మాధుర్యం సుకుమారతా,
అర్థవ్యక్తి రుదారత్వ మోజః కాంతిసమాధయః.[349]

Only two qualities mentioned by the poet are to be found in the list of the Ālamkārikās and the other two have completely nothing to do with them. Therefore these four do not refer to *Kāvya guṇas* and must belong to some other thing. If one only recollects what has been said in connection with the philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita, it will be clearly evident that splendour, beauty, fragrance, tenderness, loveliness, youthfulness, softness etc. are the qualiitiss of the divine and auspicious body of Brahman.[350]

Now it can be clearly seen that Beauty is a quality of Brahman and that it is not an object of perception. The word 'ఎంచన్' in the original text plainly indicates that it is revealed through imagination and nothing else.

At this juncture there may be a suspicion of reading one's own thought into the stanza. But this will be dispelled immediatly if it is remembered that this idea is expressed by no other person than Kalabhāsini who is not only a citizen of Dvāraka and a staunch devotee of Kṛṣṇa but also a courtezan well accomplished in so many fine arts.[351] Therefore Beauty is quality of Brahman and not a substance colour, sound, or word. Nor can it be grasped through perception or inference. Imagination only reveals it, and except this there is no other means of experiencing it.

That Beauty abides in the five forms of Brahman, the transcendental, the incarnational, the *vyūha*, the immanent and the *arcavatara* is clearly suggested throughout the poem. In connec-

tion with the fundamental principles of Viśiṣṭādvaita and its concept of Beauty,the nature of these five forms has been explained. In view of this one can easily understand the significance of introducing Laksmi Narayana-Samvāda, Sri krsna, and the descriptions of the sacred places of pilgrimage and the gods thereat. In the former the poet has given a graphic picture of the transcendental or *para* and in the second he has described one of the most important incarnations of Visnu. The elaborate description of Maṇikandhara's pilgrimage gives various sacred idols or *arcavatāras* of Viṣṇu. The immanent aspect of Brahman is revealed through all the characters. None of them, however bad, is completely devoid of goodness,and none is represented as an embodiment of evil,pure and simple. The poet has every opportunity to paint Salyāsura black without any trace of whiteness in him. But the very fact that the poet humanises him, as Dr.Reddy has pointed out, plainly shows that God is present in each and very creature in the universe however ugly and censurable his form and character may be. Due to this conception alone on the part of the poet one finds the spark of true love in Salyasura. Not only in this character but also in every other person that appears in the story one sees something divine and lovable about him.

The form *uyūha* of Brahman is only for the purpose of creation of worlds etc. as it has been cited on more than one occasion. The poetic canvas of Surana extending over the three worlds- the worlds of Brahma, Indra and the mortals-suggests beyond doubt this form of *vyūha*. Had he not this in view, he would not have these three worlds as the scenes of action and would not have conceived the story in such a way that there appears to be no unity of place. Thus according to the poet Beauty abides in five forms.

Because Beauty is a quality of Brahman, and because a quality does not exist apart from its substance, a beautiful object is a mode of the Absolute. Man or nature, therefore, cannot be its cause. Brahman alone is its cause, the one who is generally considered to be the cause or agent in its manifestation is only an instrument and nothing else. This idea is clearly brought out by the follwoing lines:

అఖిలకళలందుఁ దోడునీ డగుచు మెలఁగు
నధిపునకుఁ బాలమున్నీటి యాడుబిడ్డ.[352]

When Beauty is a quality and a beautiful object a mode of Brahman, the artist is only an instrument selected by Him for its manifestation. One will be selected to be an artist either by one's great merit or by divine grace. Barring these two,there is no other way open to become a genuine artist. One may devote all his energy and skill to the cultivation of his mind, but without this divine grace it is of no use. This point is clearly suggested by more than one episode in the story. Nārada,the divine seer,in his anxiety to excel Tumburu in music tries every means at hand, studies under each and every teacher well. known for music but fails to achieve the standard required. At last, through his severe penance, he wins the grace of the Lord and becomes a perfect musician. Even though all this trouble is not undergone by Kalabhāṣiṇi and Maṇikandhara,they also become great musicians because they have earned the grace of Sri Kṛṣṇa. This is plainly brought to the forefront when Narada says:-

క. ఏ నిన్ని పాట్లఁ బడి యీ
గానమహిమఁ గంటి నీవుఁ గల భాషిణియు
న్నేను చెమర్పక యుండం
బూనితి రది యప్రయాసమున హరికరుణన్.[353]

Maṇikandhara becomes a poet only after acquiring the grace of Mṛgēndravāhana by cutting off his tongue with the sword in that temple. This information is gained when he says:-

సీ కాంత యేఁ దొల్లి యనంతదేవ వ్రతో
ద్యాపనకాలకు ననంతపద్మ
నాభుని సన్నిధానమునకు వచ్చితి
వచ్చి యచ్చటఁ గరం బచ్చెరు వగు
కవితచే నర్దేవు వివిధభంగుల నుతి
సేయు సత్కవుల నీక్షించి యట్టి
సౌభాగ్య మేగతి సంభవించునో యను
వాంఛతో నచ్చటివారివలన

గీ. నీ మృగేంద్రవాహనసుద్ధు లెల్ల వినుచు
నపటి కీర్తైవి యునతీమారాంతరస్థ
యగుటయు నెఱింగి యే తెలిపి తగ శిలాక్ష
రోక్త సాహసవిధి నిష్ఠ మెఱచి తెలిసి. [354]

Prathamagama and his three brothers are able to indulge in *vicitrakavitva* because they are the embodiment of the four Vēdās.[355]

Since Beauty is a quality of Brahman,and since it manifests itself by divine grace through the instrumentality of the individual artist, the artist and the aesthte must be devotees. There cannot be any other relation between the Absolute and the individual self who entirely depends on Him to get his sustenance. This aspect is clearly illustrated by Nārada, Maṇikandhara and Kalabhāṣiṇi. All the three are devotees and artists of the highest rank. Nārada, is musician. Kalabhāṣiṇi has, on the other hand hand, mastery over painting, dancing and music.

As Brahman is the ultimate goal and the very basis of the universe and as the creative faculty is the gift of divine grace, the poet or any artist must create in a spirit of complete devotion to Him. No other ulterior motive, pecuniary, personal, social or partisan gains should weigh with him in his creative activities. To portray Brahman, to please Him and to adore Him and to dedicate himself to Him he must devote his faculty. This is exactly the advice of narada to Manikandhara on the eve ofhis departure when the former says:

కృష్ణానుగ్రహంబునం గలిగిన యనన్య సాధారణ సంగీత చాతు
ర్యంబు వృథ సేయక శ్రీ పురుషోత్తమ శ్రీరంగాది దివ్య క్షేత్రము
లందు ముకుంద సన్నిధిం దద్దివ్య గుణ నామ సంకీర్తన గానంబు
గావింపు మది సకల శ్రేయో నిదానంబు. [356]

This is once again repeated when the vaisṇava devotees advise Maṇikandhara in the following manner:-

సీ. ప్రకృతి పూరుషులందు బహిరంతరములనె
ప్పుడుఁ జలింపక పరిపూర్ణుఁ డగుచుఁ
జనకు నాదియును మధ్యంబు నంతము నహా
నుఁడు నధికుండు నెందును గలుగక
సర్వజ్ఞుఁడై సర్వశక్తియై సర్వ ని
యంతయై సర్వాత్ముఁడై వెలయుచు
సర్వంబు దనకు శేషముగ సర్వమునకు
శేషి దా నగుచు లక్ష్మియును దాను

గీ. రుచియు రవియుఁ జంద్రికయు జంద్రుండుఁబోలె
నయుతసిద్ధత్వ మొప్పంగ నాదిమిథున
మనఁగ సకల వేదాంత వేద్యతఁ దనర్చు
పరమ పదనాథుఁ బొగడు నీ ప్రౌఢిఁ గొలఁది. [357]

Answering the doubt regarding the utility of such an action they say:-

.... ఈ కవితచే
నిప్పుడు గాకున్న నీకు నిఁక నొక మేనం
దప్పక యొదవు థిరంబుగ
నప్పరముని పరమభక్తి .... [358]

This poetry or any Art devoted and dedicated to Brahman will certainly, Sūrana opines,put the agent on the path of *bhakti*, the royal road to release or Mokṣa. It may not take place immediately and in the very same birth, but nonetheless it will have its effect at some point in the continuum. Can the sastras do more than this to their followers? Hence genuine Art has as much value as *Sastra* or philosophy if not more.

We have seen the value of a work of Art from the standpoint of the artist. Now it is necessary to enquire into its value to the aesthete or other individuals who do not participate in its creation but only enjoy it. This aspect of Art is not dealt with directly as in the previous instances but suggested in a roundabout manner by Kalāpūrṇa's conquest. Kalāpūrṇa signifies, as it is going

to be explained under the theory of emergence of Art, only a full fledged work of Art and nothing else. The poets's elaborate description of Kalapurna's conquest of the kingdoms of Gauda of Kalāpūrna's conquest of the kingdoms of Gauda, Utkala, Kalinga, Dravida, Pāndya. Kērala, Ghurjara, Kuru, Kāsi, Prāgjyōtisa and other countries bears a twofold significance,one in the context of the emergnce of Art and the other in the context of its objective value. Because the second aspect is under consideration,it is necessary to see what the poet suggests in this respect.

From the above list of the kings conquered by Kalapurna,it is evident that a genuine work of Art will not only overcome the barriers of space but also of language and custom.It subdues unruly passions and emotions and establishes a rule of order and peace. This conception of the universality and utility of Art is not in any way peculiar to Surnan alone. Almost all the Ālamkārikās[359] have invariably expressd the same opinion. There may be one two writers like Panditaraya[360] who have not stressed upon its utility, but nevertheless they do not deny it altogether.

More valuable than the above practical use is than spiritual aspect. With the gradual development of taste the sense of Beauty in the aesthete also develops. The craving for Beauty and quest for it increases in him as a result of which he acquires the spirit of enquiry into its very nature. This search naturally leads him to see the truth that it is the quality of Brahman and there by to try to achieve that particular state which will enable him to be in eternal communion with the Absolute in which Beauty abides. Thus a good work of Art helps to realise the spiritual values,to leave behind the lusts of the flesh and thus to lift oneself above *samsāra*. This is what is meant when the Vaiṣṇavites informed Maṇikandhara that his composition would put him on the path of *bhakti*.

After the survey of the nature of Beauty in general as conceived by Surana one can now turn to his theory of poetry. Before dealing with the subject, it is not out of place to mention that there are two divergent opinions. The first opinion which claims

to be in regular contact with the traditionsl views of Alamkāra Sastra argues that though the poet has not much to say about the nature of poetry in the Kalapurnodayam,he has tried to say something in his Prabhāvatpradyumnam. It adds further that the poet's suggestion as to the imagination required on the part of the reader to enjoy his later work hints at the poet's acquaintance with *dhvani*.[361] The second opinion which does not seem to know the very significance of the *Ālamkārika* terminology which the poet uses,maintains that Surana's conception of style had changed in the Prabhāvatīpradyumnam for the better. While in the Kalapurnodayam, according to this opinion, the poet was much attached to the Alankāra Sāstra, in the latter he evinced no such faith.[362] But it is unfortunate that both the opinions should miss the truth and thus belittle Surana's achievement. If the first opinion ignores that Sūrana is the precursor to Paṇḍitarāya, the second does not perhaps realise that there is practically no change in his theory of poetry.

Before one takes up Sūrana's conception of poetry, one has to recollect that the Absolute conceived by Viśiṣṭādvaita is, unlike that of Advaita and Kāshmir Saivism, not abstract but concrete having qualities and body. Though it is distinct from the body, it does not exist apart from the body. Similarly the body also is distinct and different from the Absolute, but it does not and cannot exist separately from the Absolute. It lives and acquires value and meaning as the body of the Absolute, and not as an independent entity. Every object in the space-time world is only a mode of the Absolute drawing from it its sustenance and breath .From the standpoint of Advaita these objects are not real but illusory where as for Kāshmir Saivism they are real. For both of them these objects ultimately become one with the Absolute thereby losing their individuality. Viśiṣṭādvaita,on the other hand, belives that though they attain the nature of Brahman they do not lose their individuality.

This conception has inspired Surana to come out with a new definition of poetry. As it has been observed on a previous occasion, every object consists of a body, soul and the all-pervad-

ing Brahman. Though these three factors have different values, one cannot exclude any one of them from reality, and reality consists of these three factors. A poem is an object and as such must consist of these three factors, the body, the soul and the Absolure. If the word is the body, the content is its soul, and beauty its Absolute. Because all the three factors are real, a poem cannot exist without any one of them. To stress the equal importance of the body, Surana defined poetry as the composition of words fitting into each orther like strings of pearls strung into harmony.[363] This vague definition becomes clear with the relative position given to *dhvani, rasa, riti, guna* and *alamkara* pertaining to both the word and the meaning. Though noboky seems to have taken pains either to understand or explain this definition, it is clear that what the poet means here is that a self-evident and self-sufficient composition of words having unity in variety is poetry. This is not reading one's own thoughts into the poem because he himself explains his definition in the Prabhāvati-pradyumnam when he says through Sucimukhi:-

శబ్దసంస్కారమెచ్చుటను జాఱఁగనీక
　　　　పదమైత్రి యర్థ సంపదలఁ బొదలఁ
దలఁ పెల్ల నక్లిష్టతను బ్రదీపితముగాఁ
　　　　బునరుక్తి దోషంబు పొంతఁ బోక
యాకాంక్షితస్ఫూర్తి యాచరించుచును శా
　　　　ఖాచంక్రమక్రియఁ గడవఁ జనక
ప్రకృతార్థభావంబు పాదుకో నదుకుచు
　　　　నుపపత్తి యొందు నత్యూర్జితముగ
నొకటఁ బూర్వోత్తర విరోధమొదవకుండఁ
దత్తదవయవ వాక్య తాత్పర్య భేద
ములు మహావాక్య తాత్పర్యమునకు నొనరఁ
బలుక నేర్చుట బహుతపఃఫలము గాదె.

To put it in other words, while grammatical purity of words is nowhere neglected, affinity among the words should exist mainly in view of the richness of meaning. Thought must be very clear,

involving no difficulty for the reader and at the same time there should be no repetition whatever is necessary for understanding it should be supplied without losing oneself in unnecessary details by leaping from one point to another. What is important in the context should be established firmly. With reason pervading, and with no contradictions between the preceding and the succeeding, the various parts, sentences and purports must be in complete unity with the whole, the Mahāvākya or the Mahākāvya. All this is implied when the poet says that poetry is a compositionof words fitting into each other like strings of pearls strung into harmony. As a matter of fact he strictly followed the principle to the letter as discussed and explained in Chapters 5 and 6. When he gives this definition he is quite well aware of the various theories of *dhvani, rasa, riti, guna* and *alamkāra* which were advocated by his predecessors. This is quite obvious from the fact that the poet not only mentions them, but also assigns them their respective places in his theory. In the verse "ఏపచగ ముత్తెపుసరుల్" he comes from the highest principle to the lowest which is *sabdalamkara.* What he means there is that a poem is a composition of words which is self-sufficient,self-evident and manifesting unity in diversity. This is brought about, he thinks, only through *dhvani.* And *dhvanikara* and Abhinava have already established how *riti, guna* and *alamkāra* are subordinate to *dhvani.* He borrows this picture *in toto* and attaches it to his theory to make it both comprehensive and at the same time synthetic. Just as Panditaraya accepts the theory of *dhvani* and defines poetry as the word that manifests beautiful meaning, so also Surana accepts *dhvani* and defines it as a composition of words that is self-sufficient, self-evident and at the same time manifesting unity in deversity. Thus he makes poetry a mode of the Absolure,more concrete and definite that of paṇḍitarāya.

Now coming to the second opinion that Surna betrays no longer any attachment to Alamkāra Sāstra in the Prabhāvatī-pradyumnam, one can say that it has no textual support. If the second opinion is true, why should Sucimukhi announce with pride that she has recived the title *upamā-tisayōkti-kāmadhēnu*

from Sarasvati? If he had no respect and attachment to Alamkara he would have made Sucimikhi inform us that she had recived some other title than *upamā-tisayôkti-kāmadhēnu* Besides,as explained in the previous paragraph, the poet is only making explicit what is implicit in the first line of the verse beginning with పొంగ ముత్తెప్పసరుల్...... If this is not conceded, sucimikhi's title cannot be consistent with the conception of poetry defined in the verse beginning with శబ్దసంస్కారమొప్పులు... which occurs in the very same book, Therefore the second opinion appears to be only an opinion, not based on facts and understanding. Suruana's conception of poetry and Art as revealed in the Kalapurnodaym had not change by the time when he wrote his Prabhavatipradyumnam because, as had already been pointed out, there was no change in his outlook on life. What is to be seen is only, as Dr.Reddy points out, maturity of his style in the Prabhavatipradyumnam. It had gained more in crispness, ease, depth and naturalness that is all.

Before considering the relative merits and demerits of Surana's definition of poetry,one has to understand his theory regarding the emergence of Art which occpies a predominant position in the Kalapurnodaym. There are many theories defining Art and explaining aesthetic experience but there seems to be not even one apparently accepatable theory regarding the emergence of Art.

EMERGENCE OF ART

Art according to Sūrana is neither imitation nor reflection of Nature. The artist,he firmly believes, does not hold the mirror up to Nature and produce thereby a permanent record of fleeting images of life. Much less does he select certain portions of it that are universal and record them through his medium. He does not echo simply what is felt and thought by the majority like politician. Nor does he create out of an empty brain something dazzling and attractive. For him artistic creations are not in any way illusory or erroneous. Both a Realist and an Individualist that he

is, he not only admits the pluralistic world and its influence on the artist, but also concedes it as the ground for the emergence of Art. His own contribution lies in the realisation that a work of Art results through the artist's reaction to life that is going on without and within. Without this individualtity reacting and creating,there cannot be Art. Individualistic experience, therefore, is the *sine qua non* for a work of Art. But it is not the be-all and the end-all because, in that case, an individual's private experiences, illusions and dreams also become works of Art. What is meant is that artistic creation begins here and it is the first stage. The second stage commences with the sublimation or transformation which is again owing to subjective conditions such as the artist's outlook, reaction and culture on the one hand, and to the objective conditions such as events in the world and its conventions and regulations on the other. Even at this stage, this creation will not differ in the least from our day-to-day life. Nor does it possess grater value, higher reality or deeper significance. In the third and final stage, the artis's imagination makes it self-sufficient and self-evident. In this stage of development what are implicit in the experience of the second stage are made explicit and vice-versa as demanded by the two principles of self-sufficiency and self- evidence. Even new things and events may be added for fulfilling the two principles. In this process, at this stage, objective life will play to some extent its own role. By the time when this experience emerges as a work of Art, imagination sees to the other aspect of making the unity in diversity very clear. Thus a full-fledged work of Art, as it emerges is neither pure subjective experience like a dream nor pure universal experience like that of mathematics or any other exact science. It is *sui generis*, a unique fusion of percept and concept. According to Surana it is only universalised individualistic experence and not a univesal experience made concrete as pure idealists maintain.

Now one may wonder whether such a theory is really put forth by Surana anywhere in the Kalāpūrnōdayam. But the fact is he has done it, and in a more deatailed manner too. It is necessary,therefore, to examine how he does it and what other minute details he provides.

To every student of the Kalāpūrṇōdaym it is well known that Sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krīda is the very seed out of which the entire theme of the poem emerges. Without this there is neither unity nor value. In one word, Brahma, the divine artist, is the reason and ground for the whole creation. Out of his personal experience emerges the whole story in all its aspects. How does this occur? Has he created it out of his pure imagination with nothing to guide him and no material to mould? This is far from the truth and facts speak aginist such conclusion. His dalliance with his beloved in the garden near the lake, with a *maṇistambha* in its centre, is the very substance which is sublimated or transformed into the basic elements of the story. Sarasvati and her various actions and reactions,the parrot in the cage,and the lake with its pillar reflecting the beautiful face of the goddess are really there and Brahma puts them together. Why does he do it? Does he want to proclaim his creative power or impart some message to the anxiously awaiting universe at large? These considerations are not felt at all. He simply reacts to the beauty of Sarasvati, his love for her sublimates every element into some other thing. As the various incidents in that episode are already touched upon in one of the preceding chapters,they need not be repeated here. What concern us here are the various froms they assume in the pocess of sublimation.

The reflected face of Sarasvati, the poet himself tells us, [304] is the King Kalāpūrna. Her arched eye-brows, and sidelong glances are the bow and arrows bestowed by a *siddha* named Svabhāva on the king, whereas her beautiful lip becomes the jewel. The lake easily gests itself transformed into a city called Kasārapura. Brahma's desire, experience of formal beauty and courage are changed into the King Madāśaya, his wife Rūpānubhūti and his minister Dhīrabhāva, while the four faces of Caturmukha becomes the four *purōhits* of Madāśaya. Sarasvati's self is spoken of as Satvadātman, the minister of Kalāpūrna. Her proximity and Manistambha are transformed into Sumakhāsatti and Maṇistabha, are transformed into Sumakhāsatti and Manistambha, the fa-

ther and mother of Kalapurṇa respectively. The gentle smile on the face of the goddess becomes Abhinavakaumudi, the wife of Kalapurna. Brahma's sweet solicitation assumes the form of Madhuralalasa, the daughter of Madāśaya and the second queen of Kalapurna.

With these transformations and new realtions sarasvati-Caturmukha-Krida sublimates itself into the following story:- There lives in the city of Kasārapura a king named Kalāpurṇa. He conquers all the contemporaneous king without the least effort. The moment he is born he becomes a sturdy youth and receives a jewel, a bow and arrows invested with supernatural powers. In course of time he comes across Madāśaya, and he not only defeats him but also makes him his vassal. This hero is later on loved by Abhinavakaumudi whom he accepts as his wife. Sumakhāsatti and her husband Maṇistabha are his father and mother. With the help of his minister, Satvadatman, he becomes the anointed king of Angadēsa which has Kramuka-Kanthottara for its capital. Madasaya, having constructed golden fort around the metropolis, earns the sympathy of the monarch whose jewel bestows on Ruppanubhuti a baby called Madhuralālasa. Attracted by the jewel, the four Agamās also attend upon the monarch when it so happens that one of them offends Kalapurna by fondling with it too much. Getting wild, Kalāpūrna drives away the four purohits and demolishes the fort built by Madāśaya. Unable to bear this insult, the latter leaves the court along with his wife and child and goes to Madhyadēsa. On his way he comes across a pair of beautiful pots which gives him much solace and pleasure. But in the meanwhile his baby, Madhuralālasa, loses her health whereupon he once again returns to the court of Kalāpūrna. To his great surprise, the baby recovers immediately. Naturally Madasaya attributes this spontaneous recovery to her love for Kalapurna and requests Kalapurna to accept her as his wife. By this time she has attained proper age and enjoys the fruit of conjugal love with Kalapurṇa.

The later events in the love episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha are beautifully fitted into the story by Brahma when he consoles the curesed parrot with the boon that she will in her second birth he born as Madhuralālasa and marry Kalapurna. At the same time he utters a warning or a blessing that one revealing this story will be born on the earth and enjoy a long and prosperous life.

Now the question is why and how this sublimation or tranformation has taken place. Only one thing is known beyond doubt-every word and phrase suggests the love affair between Sarasvati and Caturmukha. Why does the divine artist suppress facts as they are and burst into the language of symbols and suggestion? This question has been touched upon by Prof. S.Kuppuswamy Sastri and discussed at some length when he says:- "What is the secret of the force of *vyanjana* as an artistic principle? I refer to the suppressed elements in the case of suggestion. Why should there be a suppressed elements at all even in ordinary sentences? We wish to create a minimum degree of interest possible in the minds of heares. Wighout interesting the hearers to some extent at least, we cannot create anything like a desirable impression on the minds of the readers. Even to attract attention, a minimum degreee of interest we should provide, and the elements of suppression is necessary. Now this element of suppression may be enhanced in its value, this element of suppression may be intensified, may be improved upon in various ways; in poetic expression, it is this element of suppression and the principle of suggestion that rests upon it that prove all important. In fact it was discovered in the 9th and 10th centuries A. D. by Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta that this is the centre, the soures of poetic charm. Well, what is the secret of this attraction? What is the secret of this force? Some people would say that there is an element of novelty in *vyañjana* or suggestion. The suggested idea is envisaged with a certain degree of novelty. What is suppressed and let out, and what is suppressed and suggested may appear novel or may be envisaged with a certain

outlook of freshness for the time being. Is this the element that is the real source of attraction? I do not think it is the real source of attraction. It is suggested by a Sanskrit writer that there is scope for some sort of intellectual quest in the process of *vyanjana*, quest provided in *vyañjana* certainaly leads to some conquest. Now these two things, quest and conquest, are enough to create some interest. Well, is it because of the scope for quest and conquest that we have in *vyañjana* that it proves to be attractive? There is some truth in this explanation but it is not the whole truth. The same idea is expressed in some works on Sanskrit poetics in another way. Something is concealed for the time being, and concealing for a moment and withholding from your view might tend to enhance the degree of charm, like distance, concealing and withholding might lead to enhance its charm—*gudham sat camatkaroti*. Like the charms of an attractive beauty which do not obtrude upon notice in an immodest way, but which are presented through a veil and in a properly concealed fashion, like the physical charms of a modest beauty, then suggested element when it is presented, when it is disclosed after some degree of concealment proves to be attractive. This is also true to some extent. But it is only a poetic way of presenting the other explanation. There is scope for quest and conquest here. But the fact is, as far as I have been able to gather, that *vyañjana* makes it possible for art, for every suggestive art to re-live its life in itself through a purely artistic process and to find its fulfilment and consummation in a definitely artistic purpose. That is the secret of the force of the whole charm of *vyañjana*". [365]

All these points are too true to be denied,and as amatter of fact,Sarasvati's reaction to this story clearly substantiates them. The only thing, however, lacking in this explanation is the subjective aspect. It does not give the clue to the workings of Brahma's creative faculty and the necessity for such a sublimation. This wonderful imagery can only be explained if one takes Brahma's profound love for Sarasvati, the temporary check it receives from the latter and the characteristics of the language and the traditon

The later events in the love episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha are beautifully fitted into the story by Brahma when he consoles the cursed parrot with the boon that she will in her second birth he born as Madhuralālasa and marry Kalāpūrṇa. At the same time he utters a warning or a blessing that one revealing this story will be born on the earth and enjoy a long and prosperous life.

Now the question is why and how this sublimation or tranformation has taken place. Only one thing is known beyond doubt-every word and phrase suggests the love affair between Sarasvati and Caturmukha. Why does the divine artist suppress facts as they are and burst into the language of symbols and suggestion? This question has been touched upon by Prof. S.Kuppuswāmy Sāstri and discussed at some length when he says:- "What is the secret of the force of *vyañjana* as an artistic principle? I refer to the suppressed elements in the case of suggestion. Why should there be a suppressed elements at all even in ordinary sentences? We wish to create a minimum degree of interest possible in the minds of hearers. Without interesting the hearers to some extent at least, we cannot create anything like a desirable impression on the minds of the readers. Even to attract attention, a minimum degreee of interest we should provide, and the elements of suppression is necessary. Now this element of suppression may be enhanced in its value, this element of suppression may be intensified, may be improved upon in various ways; in poetic expression, it is this element of suppression and the principle of suggestion that rests upon it that prove all important. In fact it was discovered in the 9th and 10th centuries A. D. by Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta that this is the centre, the soures of poetic charm. Well, what is the secret of this attraction? What is the secret of this force? Some people would say that there is an element of novelty in *vyañjana* or suggestion. The suggested idea is envisaged with a certain degree of novelty. What is suppressed and let out, and what is suppressed and suggested may appear novel or may be envisaged with a certain

outlook of freshness for the time being. Is this the element that is the real source of attraction? I do not think it is the real source of attraction. It is suggested by a Sanskrit writer that there is scope for some sort of intellectual quest in the process of *vyanjana,* quest provided in *vyañjana* certainaly leads to some conquest. Now these two things, quest and conquest, are enough to create some interest. Well, is it because of the scope for quest and conquest that we have in *vyañjana* that it proves to be attractive? There is some truth in this explanation but it is not the whole truth. The same idea is expressed in some works on Sanskrit poetics in another way. Something is concealed for the time being, and concealing for a moment and withholding from your view might tend to enhance the degree of charm, like distance, concealing and withholding might lead to enhance its charm—*gudham sat camatkarōti.* Like the charms of an attractive beauty which do not obtrude upon notice in an immodest way, but which are presented through a veil and in a properly concealed fashion, like the physical charms of a modest beauty, then suggested element when it is presented, when it is disclosed after some degree of concealment proves to be attractive. This is also true to some extent. But it is only a poetic way of presenting the other explanation. There is scope for quest and conquest here. But the fact is, as far as I have been able to gather, that *vyañjana* makes it possible for art, for every suggestive art to re-live its life in itself through a purely artistic process and to find its fulfilment and consummation in a definitely artistic purpose. That is the secret of the force of the whole charm of *vyañjana*" [365]

All these points are too true to be denied,and as amatter of fact,Sarasvati's reaction to this story clearly substantiates them. The only thing, however, lacking in this explanation is the subjective aspect. It does not give the clue to the workings of Brahma's creative faculty and the necessity for such a sublimation This wonderful imagery can only be explained if one takes Brahma's profound love for Sarasvati, the temporary check it receives from the latter and the characteristics of the language and the traditon

behind. Had Brahma to express himself in some other language, the story he gives would have been altogether different. On the other hand, if he had not such a strong desire there would have been no story at all; the lake would have continued to be a lake and Kalāpūrna would not have been born. Therefore, it is abundantly clear that the very basis of the artist's creative activity is his strong reaction to life. He does not receive it calmly and coolly like a scientist. Much less does he resemble a camera, automatically recording whatever goes on before it. On the other hand, he transforms every event of his experience in such a way that it is loaded to the full with significance, attitude, feeling and unity. Every work and event in the story of Brahma speaks of his love to Sarasvati and nothing else.

The next question how this sublimation takes place is really a great problem which has been to some extent tackled and solved by Sigmund Freud in his interpreatation of dreams. It is enough if one knows that it is the result of symnbolisation, inversion, displacement, fusion, condensation, overdetermination and the like.[366] A Various forms of *dhavani* are nothing but the various techniques which the creative activity of the mine assumes. As space and scope are limited one cannot go further into these details.

To return to the subject, the episode of Sarasvati and Caturmukha along with the story narrated by the latter comprises only the first two stages in the emergence of art. That means, the whole train of events that takes place in the world of Brahma is only ordinary life. This statement in view of the story given by Brahma may be surprising. When there is so much of wonder, novelty and suggestion,why does it not become a work of art? Is it not said that suggestion or *dhvani* is the soul of poetry? Moreover, why is it not different from ordinary life?

When it is said that all the events happening in the world of Brahma are only the first two stages and that they do not differ form ordinary life,the meaning is this:- Life is a never-ending process; and as such, the preceding event badly wants the

succeeding, and the succeeding entirely depends on the preceding. Thus it will never be complete and self-event The events occurring in the world of Brahma are also of the same nature having no completeness and self-evidence. If it is argued that these events do differ from ordinary life on the ground that the former contain sublimation or transformation or suggestion, it is better to recollect from one's own experience that even ordinary life does not lack such sublimation. A mother, when her child becomes impetuous and puts up a strong resistance, cajoles it with its own story as Brahma does. Even in dreams one does the same thing by fantastic creation of one's wish-fulfilment. These are also parts of ordinary life. Simply because there is suggestion or sublimation it does not become an aesthetic experience. Suppose two people who have no mutual goodwill happen to cross each other on a narrow stair-case, and suppose the first says impudently that he would not give way to fools while the other promptly retorts that he would. In this case there is ample suggestion-they are calling each other fool. Does this exchange of worlds become aesthetic experience for the two people involved in it? Even for others as spectators, it cannot be because they will wonder why there is so much acrimony exhibited. Therefore suggestion, simple and pure, cannot be aesthetic experience .It must have what Abhinavagupta calls *ātma-viśrānti* or self-sufficency and self-evidence. These are the only characteristice which differentiate life, private or public, from aesthetic experience. When it is said that the events in the world of Brahma are merely events of ordinary life, it means that they are not self-sufficient and self-evident.

Now the question is, in what way is the story narrated by Brahma not self-sufficient and self-evident? That Kalāpūrṇa is born to his father Maṇistambha by his mother Sumukhāsatti and that he has become a youth the moment he is born are not self-evident. Such things do not happen in this world of space and time. Why does Svabhava bestow a jewel, a bow and arrows on Kalāpūrṇa? How is the parrot born into the world of mortals and in what circumstances does she become an unchaste woman?

Is that looseness of character an inherent or acquired quality? Above all, how has the story come to be known by mortals when there is the specific prohibition by Brahma? The accounts of abhimavakaumudi, Madhuralslāsa, Maṇistambha, Sumukhāsatti, Madāśaya, Svabhāva and Satvadātman are too sketchy to give complete satisfaction.

In the third and final stage of its emergence all these shortcomings are overcome. Everything is made self-sufficient and self-evident. The story becomes a unique whole having unity in variety. For this purpose only the story of Narada, the temple of Mṛgēndravāhana and the episode of the *manihāra* are futher added though there is not even the slightest suggestion of them in the original. What are implict in the second stage are made explicit in the final. The story of Kalabhāṣiṇi, Sumukhāsatti, Abhinava-kaumudi, Alaghuvrata, Satvadātman, Madāśaya etc. becomes concreate as explained in an earlier chapter. To what extent social reality, *ālankārika* tradition and ideological inheritance influence the artist in this stage can be understood by the reader himself when he reads the episode of Sugātri, the marriage of Madhuralālasa and chapters 3, 8 and 11 of this essay.

With this final phase, there emerges a fullfledged work of Art which has meaning and values not only to the artist but also to all who know the tongue. Thus it is not an imitaion of life but a creation and improvement on life is so far as it is self-sufficient and self-evident.

Now there is one thing more to be noted so that one may not misunderstand Sūrna's theory. Just as the story of Kalapurna is a self-expression of Brahma and just as he has not gained anything new except self-satisfaction, so also the artist, it may be thought, will not gain anything but this simple self satisfaction. But this is clearly a case of misunderstanding his theory. What is to be remembered is that the artist is only an instrument in this selfexpession of Brahman. Brahman alone does not desire or acquire any worldly gains. This manifestation or self-expression gives him self-satisfaction and nothing else. The artist, on the other

hand,who is an instrument or medium not only gets this self-satisfaction but also acquires worldly gains such as wealth, fame etc. As mentioned by the *ālamkārikas*

The above survey gives Sūranā's conception of Beauty in general and poetry in particular It also explains his theory of emergence of art and its value in life. Now one can proceed with the consideration of the relative merits and demerts of consideration of the relative merits and demerits of his theory. As it has been repeatedly said that as the theory of Beauty entirely depends on epistemology,its merits and demerits also depend on it. Since Sūrana's theory is based on Viśistādvaita, its relative merits and demerits will be found in his theory too. It is now, therefore, incumbent on one to probe into them before one pronounces judgment on the poet's theory of Beauty. The one fundamental drawback in Visistadvaita is its conception of substance,quality and time. To conceive that quality has substance for its locus and that substance is ths sub-stratum of quality is not only unscientific but also illogical. If this theory is true, quality requires substance to have a locus. Now the substance similarly must require some other thing for its locus. But Visistadvaita does not concede this. On the other hand,it says that substance exists by itself. Why cannot the same thing be conceded to quality? Secondly,it maintains that *dharmadhūtajñana* and the like can both be a substance and a quality at the same time. This is a simple violation of the law of contradication unless qualtiy is identical with substance. One wonders why this school takes strong objection to Advaitin's conception Maya. Thirdly, to say that time is a substance is another fallacy similar to that mentioned under the first. Foutthly, how can the Absolute be both transcendental and immanent at the same time? Changing without change is as inconceiveble as reaching a different place without any kind of motion. Fifthly, to say that reason cannot reveal the transcendental or the noumena and that the latter can only be known through the scriptures is to send free thought and enquiry to the scaffold. It is making philosophy the hand-maid of dogma and blind faith. Sixthly and finally, cosmology and the

transcendental as conceived by Visistadvaita are only probble and not logically necessary and as such, they are little better than fiction.

If the above objections are conceded, then Beauty cannot be a quality as Surana maintains. Aesthetic experience in its highest stage which was long ago noticed and pointer out by Abhinavagupta denies it. In this context one has to think of one's own experience. When one reads a poem, one experriences *ananda*. Even after one ceases reading, the ideas still continue for some time in one's imagination. These gradulally sink below completely and a stage will be reached when there is nothing but *ānanda*. How can this be explained if Beauty is a quality and that too of Brahman who is quite different from Atman? Hence it cannot be quality at all.

That Beauty has five forms, the transcendental, the incarnational, the *vyūha*, the immanent and the *arcavatâra* is only metaphysical. To give the highest place to poetry and establish hierarchy in arts is also unjustified because each is unique and important in its own way like our five senses. The function of the ear can never be discharged by the eye. To have a full view of the universe all the five senses are essential. Similaryly life can never be complete and comprehensive without any one of the fine arts. That a work of Art invariably brings fame, confers wealth and fights out evil is rather doubtful. How can one explain the fact that we have recovered the works of Bhāsa, Nannecōda, etc., only during recent times? How many poets and artists have died in utter penury and need? Why does Peddana enjoy more popularity than Sūrana and Rāmakṛṣṇa? Recent census shows that literacy and cultivation of arts have increased. Is there a corresponding decrease in evil? All these alleged utilities of Art are probably a defence in support of its unique value which is purely intrinsic.

Setting aside these drawbacks, Sūrans's conception of poety is really satisfactory as well as comprehensive. Whatever may be one's outlook and philosophy, one cannot deny the poet's definition that poety is a composition of words having unity in variety,

self-sufficiency and self-evidence. Even suggestion, as explained above, when it is devoid of the latter qualities cannot become poetry. This definition is far better than that of Visvanatha because it admits *vastudhvani* and *alankaradhvani* also as poetry. It is more realistic than that of Panditaraya because the latter's conception of *ramaniyata* is rather abstract and metaphysical.

Above all these things, Surana's conception of the emergence of Art merits the highest consideration. He does not yield to idealism that says" the mind is its own place and in itself can make a heaven of hell and hell of heaven." Nor does he succumb to gross materalism claiming tha matter is everyting and spirit nothing. He holds the blance between the two and gives his correct judgment. His deeper insight into human psychology helps him to probe into the mysterious depths of the creative mind and give a real picture of the artistic process. There may be many things which admit of improvement but the facts he gives cannot be denied. The three phases in the artistic creation may not be as distinct and separate as he indicates. Nevertheless,they have to take place at some time or other before the work of Art emerges. Its birth is not only logical but also psychological. This is really the greatest contribution Surana has made to aesthetics, perhaps as great as Abhinavagupta's to the explanation of aesthetic experience.

With the foregoing survey in view one can say this much.His main idea in writing the Kalapurnadayam is to depict the complete emergence of Art and he has conceived it from the point of view of Visistadvaita. Misssing this point is missing the central idea of the poem and its unity as well as its beauty. If one is to judge a work of Art by the object the poet sets for himself to achieve, Surana must be declared as having achieved complete success. Even this is not a proper criterion for the judgment of a work of Art. The object or idea which the artist select for

depiction must also be self-sufficient and self-evident. When viewed from this angle, Kalāpūrṇōdayam is not altogether without fault. The episode of Laksmi-Narayana-Samvada is definitely out of place and betrays one-sided outlook while the description of Maṇikandhara's pilgrimage, Madhuralālasa's marriage and Kalāpūraṇā's expedition and conquest are some what lengthy. Apart from these three minor faults Kalāpūrṇōdayam is superb and unique. In conception and presentation,in plot and character delineation, and in breadth and depth,it is marvellous and occupies a high place in the best literary works of the world.

APPENDIX - III

పింగళి సూర నార్యుని ప్రశంస

ఉ సూరకవీంద్రుఁ డేర్పఱచుచో ప్రాకయించుక గాంచి నెమ్మదిన్
కూరిమి రామకృష్ణుఁ గనుంగొనఁ గోరి తదీయసత్కథా
సారము జోడు చేసి యొక సత్కృతిఁ గూర్పఁగ సాహసించితిన్
ధీరవరేణ్యులార యిది తెల్లముగా దయ నాదరింపుఁడీ.

ఉ. వెంగలు లెందఱో కడు వివేకము లేకను దామె యర్థపుం
భంగులు రెండుమూఁడు గల భవ్యకవిత్వముచేఁ బ్రబంధముల్
రంగుగఁ గూర్చినా మనుచు రాజస మొప్పఁగ నుందు రందుకై
పింగళి సూరనాహ్వయుఁడు బెట్టిన మార్గము గాక కల్గునే.

శ్రీపాద వేంకటాచలకవి – రామకృష్ణోపాఖ్యానము.

సీ. అల (తగ?) విన్నకోట పెద్దన లక్షణజ్ఞత
శబ్దశాసనకవి శబ్దశుద్ధి
ప్రాబంధిక పరమేశ్వరు నర్థమహిమం బు
భయక విమిత్తుని పదలలితము
శ్రీనాథు వార్తాప్రసిద్ధి నాచనసోము
భూరికారిన్యంబు పోతరాజు
యమకవిధము మల్లయమనీషి చిత్రంబు
పింగళిసూరకవివరు శ్లేష......

గణపవరపు వేంకటకవి – వేంకటేశ్వర విలాసము.

ఉ. ప్రేషము లేమియుం గనమిఁ బింగళి సూరప రామరాజస
ద్భూషణ భాషితంబు లగు పుణ్యకథాద్వయ సంగ్రహోద్భుత
శ్లేష కృతు ల్ప్రసిద్ధిఁ గని శ్రీరఘునాథ నృపాలమౌళి నా
నైషధపారిజాతకృతి నాయకరత్నముఁ జెంది హెచ్చుగన్.

కృష్ణాధ్వరి – నైషధపారిజాతీయము.

ఉ. రాఘవ పాండవీయ కృతిరత్న ముఖాఖిల సత్ప్రబంధ రే
ఖా ఘటనా మహాకవి శిఖామణి సూరపరాజ ధీమణిన్
మాఘ మయూర బాణపరిమాణ గుణ ప్రవణ ప్రధాగ్రణిన్
మాఘువ.... కీర్తిఘృణి మాఱట శేష ఫణిన్ను తించెదన్.

పృథుచరిత్ర – పట్టమట్ట సరస్వతీసోమయాజి

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SĀNSKRIT

Abhijnana Sakuntala

Abhinavabharati, Commentary on Bharata's Natyasastra, Vols. 1 & 2.

Aścaryacudāmani

Dasarupaka

Dhvanyaloka

Gitagovinda of Jayadeva

Kadambari

Kāvyadarsa

Kavyālamkāra Sutra Vrtti

Kavyanusasana

Kavyaspraksa

Kumarasambhava

Lingapuraṇa

Nātyasastra :

1. Kasi (Benares Edition)
2. Kāvyamāla Series.

Nyaya Sutras with Vatsyāyana hasya - Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.

Prasnopaniṣad with the commentaries of Sankara and Ramanuja.

Prataparudriya

Ramāyana

Rasagangadhara

Rasarnavasudhākara

RAtnavali

Sāhityadarpana

Sri Bhasya

Vakrokti jivita

Yatindramatadipika

Yōgasutras with Vyasa s Commentary and Vācas pati's Glossary.

Vēdantapancadasi

Vēdāntaparibhāsa

Bhaktirasāyana - Madhusūdanasārasvati

ENGLISH

Aristotle's Poetics

Comparative Aesthetics

Indian Philosophy - 2 Vols. Dr. S. Rādhakrishnan \Interpretation of Dreams - Sigmund Frued

Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 48

Sānskrit Drama - Keith

The Ocean of Story - 10 Vols. translation by Tawney

The philosophy of Visiṣtadvaita - Srinivasachāry

The philosophy of the beautiful - Do.

Aesthetics - Croce, B.

Social Psychology - Prof. Solomon E. Asch

TELUGU

Amuktamālyada	...	Kriṣhnadevaraya
Andhradhvanyālōkamu	...	V. Tiruvengalāchāryulu
Andhra Bhārata		
Kavita Vimarsnamu	...	K. Ramakrishnaiah
Andhra Bhāratamu	...	Kavitraya
Andhri	...	A Telugu Journal (now defunet) Vol. 2, Nos. 3, 4, 5 & t
Appakaviyamu	..	Appakavi

Bhāgavatamu . Potana.
Bhārati ... Monthly journal (1924 - 1952)
Bhāskararāmāyanamu
Kavikarnarasāvaṇamu ... Nrusimha Kavi
Kavitvatattvavicāramu ... C.R. Reddy
Kāvyālamkāra Cūdamani ... Vinnakōta Peddana
Kāvyālamkārasangrahamu ... Bhattumūrti
Kṛṣṇabhāratamu ... Śrīpāda Krishṇamūrti Sāstri
Kumārasambhavamu ... Nannechōda
Manucharitra ... Peddana
Mārkandēyapurāṇamu ... Mārana
Palnāti Vēracaritra ... Edited by A. Umākāntam
Pāndurangamahātyamu ... Tenāli Rāmakṛishṇa
Ranganātharāmāyanamu ....
Śri Kāla-hasti-Mahātmyamu ... Dhūrjati
Sukranītisaramu ... P. Mallayya Sāstri
Vasucaritramu ... Rāmarāja Bhūshaṇa
Uttaraharivamśamu ... achana Soman

Pingali Surana

Āndhrakavijīvitamulu ... G. Srirāmamūrti
Āndhra Kavula Caritra ... K. Veerēsalingamu
Essay on Pingali Sūrana - in Telugu ...
Dakṣhināmurty
Pngali Sūrana-in English ... T. Achuta Rāo

WORKS

Rāghavapāndavīyamu ... Vāvilla Edition
with Commentary
Prabhāvatipradyumnamu ... Published by the Mahā
with Commentary by Rājah of Pithāpur
P. Mallayya Sāstri
Do. ... Vāvilla Edition with
Preface by
Sūryanārāyaṇa Rāo

Kalāpurnodyayamu

(Manuscripts)

GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS LIBRARY, MADRAS

D. 435. Paper - Complete

D. 437. Paper - Complete - Noe by C. P. Brown

443. Palmleaf - do.

D. 436, 438, 439 - 46 - Incomplete

438 and 445 contain seven cantos

447. Kalāpūrṇōdaya gūḍharthasamgrahamu

Notes on selected stanzas in 5th and 6th Cantos

Kalāpurnodayamu with commentary to the end of 3rd canto

R. No. 1059 - paper - complete

TANJORE LIBERARY, TANJORE :

Kalāpūrnōdayamu with commentary to the end of 4th canto 333

No. 146 Palmleaf - Complete

146 Do - Incomplete

Printed Editions

Kalāpūrṇodayamu with Introduction by K. Brahmayya Sastry - 1906

Do. C. R. Reddy - Vāvilla Edition

Do. M. Sūryanārāyaṇa Sāstri

Do. K. Subbaiah Sāstry (Published by the Mahārājah of Pithāpur)

Summaries

CP. Brown - in English

T. Venkatakṛiṣhna Rāo - in sisamalika

G. Srirāmamūrty - Prose

G. V. Krishna Rao

Kalāpurnodyayamu

(Manuscripts)

GOVERNMENT ORIENTAL MANUSCRIPTS LIBRARY, MADRAS :

D. 435. Paper - Complete

D. 437. Paper - Complete - Noe by C. P. Brown

443. Palmleaf - do.

D. 436, 438, 439 - 46 - Incomplete

438 and 445 contain seven cantos

447. Kalapurṇodaya guḍharthasamgrahamu

Notes on selected stanzas in 5th and 6th Cantos

Kalāpūrnodayamu with commentary to the end of 3rd canto

R. No. 1059 - paper - complete

TANJORE LIBERARY, TANJORE :

Kalapurnodayamu with commentary to the end of 4th canto

No. 146 Palmleaf - Complete

146 Do - Incomplete

Printed Editions

Kalāpūrṇodayamu with Introduction by K. Brahmayya Sastry - 1906

Do. C. R. Reddy - Vāvilla Edition

Do. M. Sūryanārāyaṇa Sāstri

Do. K. Subbaiah Sāstry (Published by the Mahārājah of Piṭhāpur)

Summaries

CP. Brown - in English

T. Venkatakrishna Rao - in sisamalika

G. Sriramamurty - Prose

G. V. Krshna Rao

NOTES

CHAPTER - I

1. V.C., Canto I, V. 19.
2. Appendix 3.
3. See Bibliography, Manuscripts.
4. Tadakamalla Venkata Krishma Rao.
5. K.P., Avatārika Pr, and Vs.9, 13, 16, 106;
   Asvasantagadya; Canto8, V.269.
6. N.K.S., Canto 12, V. 224.

6-a. The actual word used by the poet is *prabandha* and not Mahāprahandh (N.K.S., Canto 1, V.48),
but all the same the latter alone is meant.

7. A.B.K.V., pp.377 - 80.
8. సందర్భేషు రూపకం శ్రేయః॥
   సందర్భేషు = ప్రబంధేషు, రూపకం = నాటకాది, శ్రేయః.
9. For further deatails Vide Chapt.8, pp., 230 - 231.
10. సైషా సర్వైవ వక్రోక్తి రనయార్థో విభావ్యతే.

కావ్యాలంకార. 2-85

11. సర్గబంధో మహాకావ్యం మహతాం చమహచ్చయత్,
అగ్రామ్యశబ్ద మర్థంచ సాలంకారం సదాశ్రయమ్.
మంత్ర దూత ప్రయాణాజి నాయకాభ్యుదయై శ్చయత్,
పంచభిః సంధిభి ర్యుక్తం నాతివ్యాఖ్యేయ మృద్ధిమత్.
చతుర్వర్గాభిధానేపి భూయసార్థోపదేశకృత్
యుక్తం లోకస్వభావేన రసైశ్చ సకలైః పృథక్.
నాయకం ప్రాగుపన్యస్య వంశ వీర్య శ్రుతాదిభిః,
నతస్యైవ వధం బ్రూయా దన్యోత్కర్షాభిధిత్సయా.
యది కావ్యశరీరస్య న స వ్యాపిత యేష్యతే
న చాభ్యుదయభాక్ తస్య ముఖాదౌ గ్రహణం స్తవే.

కావ్యాలంకార. 1-19-23.

12. సర్గబంధో మహాకావ్య ముచ్యతే తస్య లక్షణమ్,
ఆశీర్నమస్క్రియా వస్తునిర్దేశో వాపితన్ముఖమ్.
ఇతిహాస కథోద్భూత మితర ద్వాసదాశ్రయమ్,
చతుర్వర్గఫలోపేతం చతురోదాత్తనాయకమ్
నగరార్ణవశైలర్తు చంద్రార్కోదయవర్ణనైః.
ఉద్యాన సలిల క్రీడా మధుపాన రతోత్సవైః.
విప్రలంభై ర్వివాహైశ్చ కుమారోదయ వర్ణనైః.
మంత్రదూత ప్రయా ణాజి నాయకాభ్యుదయై రపి
అలంకృత మసంక్షిప్తం రసభావనిరంతరం,
సర్గై రనతివి స్తీర్ణైః శ్రవ్యవృత్తైః సుసంధిభిః.
సర్వత్రభిన్నవృత్తాంతై రుపేతం లోకరంజకమ్,
కావ్యం కల్పాంతరస్థాయి జాయేత సదలంకృతి.
న్యూన మ ప్యత్రయైఃకైశ్చి దంశైః కావ్యం న దూష్యతి,
య ద్యుపాత్తేషు సంపత్తి రారాధయతి తద్విదః

కావ్యాదర్శ. ప్రథమపరిచ్ఛేద. **14-20**

నాయకం ప్రా గుపన్యస్య గుణత స్తేన విద్విషాం
నిరాకరణ మిత్యేష మార్గః ప్రకృతి సుందరః.
వంశ వీర్య శ్రుతాదీని వర్ణయిత్వా రిపో రపి
తజ్జయా న్నాయకోత్కర్ష వర్ణనం చ ధినోతి నః.

13. వన జల కేళీ రవి శశి
తనయోదయ మంత్ర గతి రత క్షితిప రణాం
బునిధి మధు ఋతు పురోద్వా
హ నగ విరహ దూత్య వర్ణనా ష్టాదశమున్

వ పరిపూర్ణంబై దశప్రాణంబుల సప్రాణంబై నవరసభావ భరితంబై
షట్త్రింశ దలంకారా లంకృతంబై రమణీయంబైన దివ్యకథ

14. నగరార్ణవశైలర్తు చంద్రార్కో దయవర్ణనం
ఉద్యాన సలిల క్రీడా మధుపాన రతోత్సవః
విప్రలంభో వివాహశ్చ కుమారోదయవర్ణనం
మంత్ర ద్యూత ప్రయా ణాజి నాయకాభ్యుదయా అపి

ఏతాని యత్ర వర్ణ్యంతే తన్మహాకావ్య ముచ్యతే.

ఏతేషా మష్టాదశా నాం వర్ణనానాం యైః కైశ్చి దూన మపీష్యతే.

ప్రతాపరుద్రీయే కావ్యప్రకరణం.

15 పురవారాశి మహీధరర్తు శశభృ త్సూర్యోద యోద్యాన పు
ష్కరకేళీ మధుపాన మోహన వియోగ క్షేమ యాన స్వయం
వర పుత్రోత్సవ మంత్ర దూత్య రణ దోర్విక్రాంతి సంకీర్తనా
కర మష్టాదశవర్ణనాన్వితము తాత్కావ్యంబు భవ్యం బిలన్.

కావ్యాలంకారచూడామణి, తృతీయోల్లాసము. 92

This author considers the word *prabandha* as a synonym of Mahākāvya, ibid., 91.

16. S.D., Chapt 6, Ks. 315 - 324.

17. Comparative Aesthetics, Chapter 3, p.173.

18. తత్ర పురుషార్థనిష్ఠాః కాశ్చి త్సంవిద ఇతి ప్రధానం తద్యథా –
రతిః కామ తదనుషంగి ధర్మార్థనిష్ఠా, క్రోధ స్తత్ప్రధానే
ష్వర్థనిష్ఠః, కామధర్మ పర్యవసితో వ్యుత్సాహః, సమస్త ధర్మాది
పర్యవసిత స్తత్త్వజ్ఞానజనిత నిర్వేద ప్రాయో విభావో మోక్షోపాయ
ఇతి తావత్. ఏషాం ప్రాధాన్యం యద్యపి చైషా మన్యోన్యం
గుణభావోస్తి తథాపి తత్తత్ప్రాధానే రూపకే తత్తత్ప్రాధానం
భవతీతి రూపక భేదపర్యాయేణ సర్వేషాం ప్రాధాన్య మేషాం
లక్ష్యతే. అదూరభాగాభినివిష్టదృశ స్త్వేకస్మి న్నపి రూపకే
పృథక్ప్రాధాన్యం. తత్రసర్వేపి సుఖప్రధానాః స్వసంవిచ్చర్వణ
రూప స్యైకఘనస్య ప్రకాశస్య ఆనంద సారత్వాత్. తథాహి.
ఏక ఘన శోక సంవి చ్చర్వణేపి లోకే స్త్రీలోకస్య హృదయ
విశ్రాంతి రంతరాయశూన్య విశ్రాంతిశరీరత్వాత్ అవిశ్రాంతి రూప
తైవ దుఃఖం. తత ఏవ కాపిలై ర్దుఃఖస్య చాంచల్య మేవ ప్రాణత్వే
నోక్తం. రజోవృత్తిం వదద్భి రిత్యానందరూపతా సర్వరసానాం.
కిం తూపరంజక విషయవశా త్తేషామపి ....కిం నాస్తి స్పర్శో
వీరస్య. సహిక్లేశ సహిష్ణుతాది ప్రాణ ఏవరత్యాదీ నాం ప్రాధాన్యం.
హాసాదీ నాం తు సాతిశయం సకల లోక సులభ విభావ తయోప

రంజకత్వ మితి ప్రాధాన్యం. అత ఏవా నుత్తమ ప్రకృతిషు
బాహుళ్యేన న (?) హాసాదయో భవంతి. పామరప్రాయః సర్వోపి
హసతి, శోచతి, బిభేతి, పరనిందా మాద్రియతే, అల్పసుఖభాషి
ఉత్సవ సర్వత్ర విస్మయతే. తత్యాదిష్వంగపయోతా పుమర్థోపి
యోగిత్వ మపి స్యా దేషాం.

నాట్యశాస్త్రం, పేజి 283.4.

19. కావ్యం యశసేర్థకృతే, వ్యవహారవిదే, శివేతరక్షతయే,
సద్యః పరనిర్వృతయే కాంతాసమ్మితత యోపదేశయుజే.

కావ్యప్రకాశ. అధ్యా. 1-2

ధర్మార్థ కామ మోక్షేషు వైచక్షణ్యం కలాసు చ,
కరోతి కీర్తిం ప్రీతిం చ సాధుకావ్యనిషేవణం.

భామహ, అధ్యాయం 1-2

సాధుశబ్దార్థ సందర్భం గుణాలంకార భూషితం,
స్ఫుటరీతి రసోపేతం కావ్యం కుర్వీత కీర్తయే.

వాగ్భటాలంకార.

చతుర్వర్గ ఫల ప్రాప్తిః సుఖా దల్పధియా మపి
కావ్యా దేవ.

సాహిత్య దర్పణ. 1-2.

కావ్యం సద్దృష్టాదృష్టార్థంచ ప్రీతి కీర్తి హేతుత్వాత్.

కావ్యాలంకారసూత్రవృత్తిః. 1-1-5

20. మజ్జన పుష్పావచయన సంధ్యా చంద్రోదయాది వాక్య మిహ
సరస మపి నాతిబహుళం ప్రకృతిరసాన్వితం రచయేత్
యస్తు సరి దద్రి సాగర పుర తురగ రథాది వర్ణనే యత్నః
కవిశక్తి ఖ్యాతిఫలో వితతధియాం నో మన స్స ఇహ.

21. See Nāṭyaśāstra, Sṛṅgāraprakāśa and Bhāvaprakāśana on classification of *rasās* (causal and derivate), their presiding deities, *nāyikās* and *nāyakās*.

22. Poetics, Tr. by Ingram Bywater, pp., 40 - 41.

23. P.V., Intr. to the first edition, p., 71.

24. Poetics, Tr.by Bywater, pp., 82 - 83.

25. Vide infara pp., 165 - 168
26. P.S., pp., 78 - 83
27 BH., Dec. 1941.
28. Bh., Vol.24 Issue No 4
29. Bh., Vol.24, Issue 2.
30 Introduction to K.
31 P.S., p., 78.
32. None the less it would be idle to pretend that the play has any dramatic force. S.Dr., p., 253.

32-a. M P., Canto 3, vs.110 - 116.

33. The Krishna Bhārata, Aranya Parvam, p., 361 - 363.
34 Udyōgaparva pp., 310 - 313.
35. Tikkanā's Anuśāsanika Parvam, canto1, pp., 27 - 29 (vs. 287 - 308).

36. సురతంబునఁ గడు నెక్కుడు
పురుషులకంటెను సుఖంబు పొలతులకు సురే
శ్వర యుల్లగుటను నాకీ
వెరవున రమియించి సిలువ వేఁడుక గలిగెన్

అను శా., ఆ. 1, ప. 307.

37. K.P., Canto 5, v.106

38. This interpretation may appear to be far-fetched,ingenious and arbitray; but all the same it seems to be true,because the experience referred to by Manistambha is not his personal or immediate experience Nor is he said to have received that idea from some one else. Besides if it is a solitary case,the allegation may hold good,but there is more than one occasion when this sort of suggestion occurs. And to consider them all as mere accidents is hardly rational unless life is reckoned as one such bundle. See pages 75-77 and Chapt XII.

39. Bh., Dec1941.

40. Bh., Vol.24, Issue 2

41. మీకు గానవిద్య చేతఁ దుంబురుని గెల్చు సంభ్రమంబు యిప్పటిమాటలం
వలన నెఱుంగంబడియె; నతని యం దిట్టి బద్ధమత్సరం బేల పుట్టె?

కళా., 2 ఆ., 67 ప.

42. P.S., pp., 81 - 83.

43. Bh., Vol. 1, pp., 6 - 7.

46. An abridged version of O.S., Vol. 1, pp., 106 - 110.

47. O.S., Vol.5, pp., 153 - 156

48. Ibid., p., 155

49. O.S., Vol.4., p., 58

50-a. O.S., Vol. IX, pp., 17 - 25.

51. గీత గోవింద సర్గ 5. శ్లో॥ ''ఆశ్లేషాదను...... రసః.''
శుక సప్తతి 5వ కథ.

52. O.S.,Vol IX, pp., 17 - 25

53. K.P., Canto 3, p., 161, v.188.

54. K.P., Ed, By M.S., p., 208.

55. Vālmıki Rāmāyama, Aranya Kānda Cantos 17and 46. Ranganātha Rāmāyana, Aranya Kānda, lines 384 & 44(and 940 -1010.

56. నినుఁ బోలు వనిత నీకును
వనజముఖీ యితనిఁ బోలువాఁ డితనికి నెం
దును గల్గి కలఁడునో యి
ట్టి నిగాఢపు ముదము సొంపు రీవులు చనునే.

K.P., Canto I, v. 167

57. K.p., Canto 1, p., 6.

58. Ibid., p., 50.

59. Ibid., p., 226

60. Quoted by Mr. Mallādi Srūyanārāyama Sāstri and Gurajāda Srirāma Mūrthi.

61. R.p.,Canto 1, v.17.

62 సీ. [illegible]

[illegible]

జాతిక్రియాదిక సకల పదార్థ వా

క్యార్థాంతరము లెవ్వి యవియు యిందుఁ

గలయవి యిందుఁ దత్సాధకంబె భేదంబు

పరికింప నొనరించెఁ బడసె నిలిపె

నను నివి మొదలైనయట్టి ధూతార్థంబు

క్రియలపట్టున నొనరించుఁ బడయు

గీ. నిలుపు నను నివి యాదిగాఁ గల భవిష్య

దర్థవచనంబు లైన క్రియాపదంబు

లనుచుకొనుటయె వాసి యొందును దలంప

నో సుధాంశు విలాస ప్రహాసివదన.

వ. మఱియు శ్రోతృజనాపేక్షానుసారంబునఁ దత్తన్నిమిత్తోపాఖ్యా

నంబులచేత నిదియు కొంత విస్తారంబు నొందఁ గల దది చెప్పఁ

బనియేమి ప్రధానకథా భాగం బింతియు.

కళా పూ., ఆ. 5., ప. వ. 60-61.

63. కొమ్మ మున్ను నీ వాత్మలోఁ గోరినట్టి

కాంతు రంభామనోహరాకారుఁ డగుచు,

మెఱయు వానిని గూడి రమింపఁ గలవు

నమ్ము పొమ్మిఁక నీ భవనమున కనియె.

క. పూ., ఆ. 2., ప. 45.

64. K.P., Canto 6, v.162.

65. Vide Dh. A, Udyota 4.

66. A.Dh.A.p.722

67. Inroduction to the second edition, P.V.., p., 36.

Introduction to the first edition, P.V., pp., 53-54.

68. అథ హైనం సుకేశా భారద్వాజః పప్రచ్ఛ, భగవన్ హిరణ్యనాభః,
కౌసల్యో రాజపుత్రో మా ముపేత్యైతం ప్రశ్నమపృచ్ఛత షోడశ
కలం భారద్వాజ! పురుషం వేత్థ? త మహం కుమార మబ్రువం నా
హ మిమం వేద యద్యహ మిమ మవేదిషం కథం తేనావక్ష్యామీతి
సమూలో వా ఏష పరిశుష్యతి యోऽనృత మభివదతి తస్మా
న్నార్హా మ్యనృతం వక్తుం సతూష్ణీం రథ మారుహ్య ప్రవవ్రాజ.
తంత్వా పృచ్ఛామి క్వాసౌ పురుష ఇతి

ప్రశ్నోపనిషద్ 6.1.

69. షోడశకలం షోడశ సంఖ్యాకాః కలా అవయవా ఇ వాత్మ
న్యవిద్యా ధ్యారోపితరూపా యస్మిన్ పురుషే, సోయం షోడశకలః

శంకరభాష్యం.

ప్రాణాద్యా నామాంతాః షోడశకలా యస్య స షోడశకలః.

రామానుజ భాష్యం

70. k.p., Canto 1, Vs. 201 & 204

71. య ఏవం విద్వాన్ ప్రాణం వేద నహాస్య ప్రజా హీయతే అమృతో
భవతి. త దేష శ్లోకః.

72. ఏవ ముత్పత్త్యాగమన ప్రతిష్ఠాది ప్రకారేణ ప్రాణం య ఉపాస్తే
తస్య పుత్త్ర పౌత్త్రాది లక్షణప్రజాహానిర్నభవతి. పరిశుద్ధ ప్రత్య
గాత్మ స్వరూప ప్రతిపత్తిముఖేన బ్రహ్మోపాసన ప్రీతిద్వారా
మోక్ష హేతుశ్చ భవతీతి ద్రష్టవ్యం. తత్ప్రాణ వేదన మధికృత్య
ప్రవృత్తోయం శ్లోక ఇత్యర్థః. (రామానుజ భాష్యం)

73 P.S.,p.,318.

74. పృథివీచ పృథివీమాత్రా, చాప శ్చాపోమాత్రాచ, తేజశ్చ తేజో
మాత్రా చ, వాయుశ్చ వాయుమాత్రా, చాకాశ శ్చాకాశ
మాత్రాచ, చక్షుశ్చ ద్రష్టవ్యంచ, శ్రోత్రంచ శ్రోతవ్యంచ, ఘ్రాణంచ,
ఘ్రాతవ్యంచ, రసశ్చ రసయితవ్యంచ, త్వక్చ స్పర్శయితవ్యంచ,

వాక్ చ వక్తవ్యంచ, హస్తౌ చాదాతవ్యం, చోపస్థ శ్చానంద
యితవ్యంచ, మనశ్చ మంతవ్యంచ, బుద్ధిశ్చ బోద్ధవ్యం, చాహం
కార శ్చాహంక ర్తవ్యంచ, చిత్తంచ చేతయితవ్యంచ, తేజశ్చ విద్యో
తయితవ్యంచ, ప్రాణశ్చ విధారయితవ్యంచ.

ప్రశ్నో పనిషద్, 4. ప., 8. మంత్ర

75 స ప్రాణ మసృజత్ ప్రాణా చ్ఛ్రద్ధాం ఖం వాయు ర్జ్యోతి రాపః
పృథి వీంద్రియం మనః, అన్న మన్నా ద్వీర్యం తపో మంత్రాః,
కర్మ లోకాః లోకేషు చ నామ చ.

ప్రశ్నో పనిషద్. ప్రశ్న 6. మంత్ర 4

76. P S., pp., 85 - 88

77 P.S., p., 323

78. P.S., p., 101

79 యత్రార్థః శబ్దో వాత మ7ర్థ ముపసర్జనీకృత స్వార్థౌ,
వ్యంక్తః కావ్యవిశేషః స ధ్వని రితి సూరిభిః కథితః

ధ్వన్యాలోక.

చిత్రంలరే జాశక్యం యత్తచ్చారుత్వం ప్రకాశయన్,
శబ్దో వ్యంజకతాం బిభ్ర ద్ధ్వ న్యుక్తే ర్విషయీ భవేత్
వాచ్య వాచక చారుత్వ హేతూనాం వివిధాత్మ నాం,
రసాదిపరతా యత్ర సధ్వనే ర్విషయో మతః

ధ్వన్యా. ఉద్యోత. 2, కారికా 4.

80. K.P., Ed. by K. Subbaiah Sāstri, pp., 261 - 264.

81. నీ చెల్లెలో మీ సేవ సేయుచు నింతమా

త్రము నెఱుంగఁగ లేన ప్రాణనాథ

యీ వింటిమాటలు నిట్టిభావంబుల

విధము నే నిచ్చిన విద్యలకద

కళాపూ., ఆ. 5., ప 45.

82. ఇది యంతయు నిట్ల యగునో కాదో యానతీయువలయు ననిన నతండట్ల తప్పదనినగుటయు.

క. పూ , 5ఆ., వ. 63

289

83. K.P., Canto 5, v.63
84. P.S., Vide pp., 91 - 98.
85. Ibid., p., 91.
86. Ibid.. p.. 94.
87. K.P., Canto 5, v.45.
88. Ibid., v.110.
89. P.S., p., 98
90. Andhri, Vol.2, Issue No.3.
91. Dictinoary of World Literature, Ed.by Shipley J.1.,p., 21.
92. This is still the case with so many of our Indian critics. Even Bharata,Ānandavardhana and abhinavagupta did not altogether escape this muddle because their differentiation of *rasābhāsās* and *bhāvabhāsās* and the classification of *nāyakās* or heroes under four types is definitely coloured by their absolure utilitarian ethis. But their great merit lies in admitting even *rasabhāsās* and *bhāvabhāsās* to the class of *rasa*

93. స చ రసాదిధ్వని ర్వ్యవస్థిత ఏవ. నహి తద్శూన్యం కావ్యం కించి దస్తి. యద్యపి చ రసేనైవ సర్వం జీవతి కావ్యం.

ధ్వన్యాలోక. పే. 72

తేన రస ఏవ వస్తుత ఆత్మా; వస్త్వలంకారధ్వనీతు సర్వధా రసం ప్రతి పర్యవసేతే; ఇతి వాచ్యాదుత్కృష్టౌ తా వి త్యభిప్రాయేణ ధ్వనిః కావ్య స్యాత్మేతి సామాన్యేనోక్తం

ధ్వన్యాలోకః పే 31

రసస్య చర్వణాత్మనః ప్రాధాన్యం దర్శయన్ రసధ్వనే రేవ సర్వత్ర ముఖ్యభూత మాత్మత్వ మితి దర్శయతి.

ధ్వన్యాలోచన. పేజి 13.

94. తథాపి ప్రీతి రేవ ప్రధానం. అన్యధా ప్రభుసమ్మితేభ్యో వేదా దిభ్యో మిత్రసమ్మితేభ్య శ్చేతిహాసాదిభ్యో వ్యుత్పత్తి హేతుభ్యః కోస్య కావ్యరూపస్య వ్యుత్పత్తిహేతో ర్జాయాసమ్మితత్వలక్షణో విశేష ఇతి ప్రాధాన్యే నానంద ఏవోక్తః. చతుర్వర్గవ్యుత్పత్తే రపి చానంద ఏవ పార్యంతికం ముఖ్యం ఫలం.

లోచన పే. 14.

95. సీ. శబ్దసంస్కార మెచ్చటను జాఱఁగనీక
పదమైత్రి యర్థసంపదలఁ బొదలఁ
దఁగ పెల్ల నక్లిష్టరచన ప్రతీపితము గాఁ
బునరుక్తికి దోషంబు పొంతఁ బోక
యాకాంక్షితస్ఫూర్తి యాచరించుచును శా
ఖా చంక్రమక్రియఁ గడవఁ జనక
ప్రక్కలార్థ భావంబు పాదుకో నదుకుచు
నుపపత్తి నొందు నత్యూర్జితముగ

గీ. నొకటఁ బూర్వోత్తర విరోధ మొందకుండఁ
దత్త దవయవ కావ్య తాత్పర్యమునకు నొనరఁ
ములు మహావాక్య తాత్పర్యమునకు నొనరఁ
బలుక నేర్పు బహుళఫలము గాదె?

ప్రభా. ప్ర., ఆ. 2., ;., 3. 291

CHAPTER - V

96. Ap., Canto 2, V. 234
97. K.Pr. Chapter 7, k.60.S.D echoes the same in chapter 7, Ks.12 - 15.
98. That Mammata was misguided on this issue has been ably presentd by Sri V. Tiruvengalāchāryula garu in his A.Dh.A.See pp., 548 - 557.
99. K.T.V., part 2, Chapter 1, p. 143,
100. K.T.V., p.143
102. K.P., Canto 8,vs 175,177and 178
103. This reading is inept. The word గుప్తమై suits the context better.
104. K.P., Canto 8, vs.167, 168 & 171.
105. K.T.V., p., 145.
106. Aristotle's Poetics, Tr.By Bywater, pp., 91 - 92.
107. N.S., Chapters 14, 18 and 23.

108. S.K.M.,Canto 3,vs.157-171.

109. K.T.V., p.143.

110. K.P., Ed.by Sūryanārāyana Sastri, p.488.

111. వ. కళాపూర్ణుండు నమ్మధురలాలసను మున్ను తల్లిదండ్రుల యింటన పెరుఁగ నిమ్మని యనుచుట యాదిగా నభినవకౌముదీవిహార విశేషంబులవలనను రాజ్యకార్య వ్యాసంగములవలసినను మఱచి మతియెన్నఁడుఁ దడవఁ డయ్యె. మదాశయుండు నతని చిత్తంబు తెలుం గెలుంగక యూరకుండె ... ..

112. K.S., Sarga 1, Sl.5.

113. For a detaild study of this problem the present writer's Jēgantalu parts 1 & 3 may be consulted .

114 K.P., Canto 6, vs.202 and 204.

115. K.P., Canto 5, v.59.

116&117. Ibid., Canto 6, vs.195 - 196.

118. Ibid.Canto 4, v.185.

119. K.P., Canto 7, vs.91 - 96

120. K.T.V., pp., 238 -9.

121. K.P., Canto 7., vs.274 & 275.

123&124. Krishna Bhārata, Aranya Parvam, Canto 1, vs 261 -263

125. SN., p., 116.

126. Nāchana Sōmana's Uttaracharivamśam,Canto 2.v.91

127. ప్రపంచఖ్యాతము లగు కథలతో విరోధించినట్టి కల్పనలు అయోగ్యములు

K.T.V., P. 242

128. V.J., p. 42.

129. Dh.A., Udyota 3, p. 183.

130. K.p , Canto 8, v.178. The text is the same in all the editions.

130-a. K.T.V., pp., 145 - 6.

131. K.P., pp. 115 - 122.

132. R.P., Canto 2, vs. 93 - 100

133. K.T.V., p.147.

134. అమ్మణికంధరుఁడు పుత్త్రోదయం బైనయనంతరంబ తన తొల్లింటి మగతనంబు తనకును సుముఖాసత్తి యాఁడుఁదనంబు సుముఖాసత్తికిని గలుగునట్లు రామచేతం బలికించి యాభార్యయుం దాను దమతమ పూర్వనామ ధేయంబులతోడస తిరుగ యోగాభ్యాస భాసురు లగుచుఁ గాసారపురంబునస యున్న వార కీ రహస్యంబు వారివలనం దార్వాణ గాఁ దెలియవలసినఁ దెలియుం డని పలికి యిట్లనియె.

కళాపూ., ఆ. 5., ప. 136.

135. K.p., Canto 6., v. 77.

136. ... అతని యాత్మజుఁ డ యజ్ఞశర్మాఖ్యుఁడతని కంటె
దయ్యె వేదాదివిద్యలయం దొకటియుఁ
బరమ యత్నంబుతో నెన్నిపాట్లు పడిన.

కళాపూ., ఆ. 6, ప. 79.

137. K.T.V., pp., 210 - 11.

138. P.S.P., ...

139. Dh.A. Udyōta 3.

140. S.D., Paricchēda 7, Ks.12 - 15.

141. P.S., p., 116.

142. K.P., Canto 7, Vs.43 - 45.

143. K.P., Ed .by M.S., p.172.

144. K.P., Canto 3, v.118.

145. Idbid., Vs.114 - 115.

146. K.p., Ed.by K.S., Canto 3, Pr.44 seems to be an unnecessary interpolation.

147. అతని దూరదృష్టి దూరశ్రవణములు మిక్కిలి పరిమితములు. దూరమందలి వస్తువును, శబ్దమును, అప్పటికప్పుడు కన్నట్లును విన్నట్లును దెలుపఁ జాలును. అంతేకాని, అందలి నిజానిజములను మార్పులను దెలుపఁ జాలవు.

కళా పూ., మ. సూ. శాస్త్రి వ్యాఖ్యాతము.

148. If the interpretatation of the critic is true,an object under constant observation,when it undergoes a radical change should not be recognised. When there can be no such recognition, the law of causality is absolutely impossible. Added

to this, the above interpretation goes against the *satkaryavada* and *satkhyativada* of Visistadvaita which is going to be proved to be the philosophy of the poet in a subsequent chapter. However, all these considerations would have been thrown overboard if the poet had mentioned that Manistambha would not be able to recognise the persons in their assumed froms. But such a statement is nowhere to be found.

149. This may appear to be contradicted by the following words of Manistambha:-

లదియునుగాక యా విపినమంతయు నెంతయు సావధానతన్
బదిలముగాఁగ నప్పడఁతిఁ బాయక యప్పుడు దూరదృష్టిచే
వెదకి కనంగ లేక కడు విస్మయమందుచు నేమిమాయయో
యిదియని వీరలైన నొక యీ గడువెళ్ళునొ యంచు నేగితిన్

K.P.,Canto 3,v.178.

In view of the consideration mentioned above these words of Manistambha are to be taken as the result of his illusion.

150. K.P., Ed byM S.p., 168.

151. మించుగ మా గురువులు శి
క్షించిన యా యెక్కిరింత సింగమునకు నూ
హించ నొక నాల్గు గడియల
సందారము వలయు నతనిసన్నిధిఁ జేరన్

K.P., Canto 5, v. 65.

152. ఆ వనిత యామాట నియ్యకొనువారల నిద్దఱం బాయంబాయఁ
బిలిచి యొకఁడు వినకుండ నొకనితోడ మనకుఁ దొల్లి కలాపూర్ణుం
డనువాని ప్రసంగం బెచ్చటఁ గలిగెఁ దత్ప్రకారం బేమి నీవు
వింటి వని యడుగుటయు నందు ద్వితీయుఁడు దానికి సమ్మతంబుగా
నుత్తరం బిచ్చెఁ బ్రథముండు వెలవెలంబాఱుచు నూరకుండె....

క. పూ., ఆ. 3 , వ 283.

153. Vide Andra Kavi Jivitamulu, pp., 348 - 9 and P.S., p., 104

154. K.P., Canto 3, v. 212

155. Ibdid.. v. 222.

156. It is interesting to note here that Indian thought maintains that poetrv is the result of genious,study or scholarship in various branches of Knowledge and constant practice put together. But Pasnditarāya asserts that poetry is the result of genius alone and nothing else and that this peculiar character of genius may be had either by the grace of a deity or a seer,or by peculiar study (విలక్షణ వ్యుత్పత్తి) and constant practic of writing poems.Vide Rasagangādhara, Chapter1.

157. K.P., Canto 1, v. 149.

158 తపోవనమునఁ దన్ను బొందినవాఁడు నలకూబర రూప మణికంధరుఁ డని కలభాషిణి కిప్పటికిని దెలియదు కాని, నారదుడు వచ్చునప్పటికిఁ దన చెంత నున్నది రంభారూప కలభాషిణి యని యా మౌనిమాటలవల్ల మణికంధరుఁ డెఱుఁగక పోలేదు. అయినను, ఆ విషయ మితఁ డెఱుఁగనట్లుగా గథ నడిపించుట కవి చాతురి. ఆద్వారక చెంత రంభతోను (1-60) కలభాషిణితోను (2-46) వేఱు వేఱు సమయము లందు తా నన్నమాటలు నారదు డప్పగించెను ఆ సమయములందు తా నన్నమాటలు నారదు డప్పగించెను. ఆ సమయములం దా మాటలు పటు నలకూబరుడు స్వయముగా విన్నవే కావున, కార్యకారణ భావము స్మరించుకొని వీరిద్దఱిలో నొకతె రంభ యనియు, నొకతె కలభాషిణి యనియు, దప్పక తెలియగలుగును కాని, యా విషయము కథలో బయటఁ బడదు. అది కథామర్మము.

K.P., Ed. by M.S., p. 192.

159. శిష్య సమేతంబుగా నతనిం (నారదుని) దమ విమానమునందు నునుచుకొని

క. నినుఁ బోలు వనిత నీకును
వనజముఖీ యితనిఁ బోలువాఁ డితనికి నెం
దును గల్గి కలఁచునో యి
ట్టి నిగాఢపుమదము సొంపు రీవులు చనునే

క. పూ., ఆ 1, ప. 160 -167

160. గీ. కొమ్మ మున్ను న వాత్మలోఁ గోరినట్టి
కాంతు రంభామనోహరకారుఁ డగుచు
మెఱయువానిని గూడి రమింపఁగలవు
నమ్ము పొమ్మిఁక నీభవనమున కనియె.

వ. అని యుపన్యసిత ననిపి మణికంధరుఁడుం దానును సముచిత భాష
ణంబులు గొంతతడవు నడిపి నారదుఁడు నిజేచ్ఛం జనియె

161. నలకూబరుండును దత్ప్రసంగము బెట్టిదియో కాని యొఁగా
ములు వివేకింపలేక యిది యిట్టి శాపంబునకుఁ దగు నని పలికి
యోసి నీ పేరెట్టిది యెట్టిదాన వని యడిగె ....

కళాపూ., ఆ 3, వ. 246.

162. K.P., Ed.by M.S., p. 231

163. K.P., Canto 5, vs.199 - 202.

164. K.P., Canto 3, pr.246.

165. K.P., Canto 3, v.221.

166. K.P., Canto 4, vs 23 - 25.

167. అయినా జరిగినదాని నిది సమర్థించుటమాత్రము దడి తీసి గోడ పెట్టిన ట్లైంతయు సమరి దీని తెలివిని జాటుచున్నది.

మ. సూ. శా., క. పూ., పే. 258

168. K.T.V., pp., 207 - 208

169. Nyāya Sūtrās, Chowkamba Sanskrit Serice 3 - 2-4', p.609.

170. K.P., Canto 4, vs.117, 118 and 120.

171. K.P., Canto 4, vs.92, 94and 106

172. K.P., Canto 4, pr.145

173. K.P., Canto 4, v.113

174. K.P., Canto 4, v.114

175. K.P., Canto 5, pr.70.

176. K.P., Canto 5, v.52.

177. K.P., Canto 1, v.154

178. Ibid., v.159.

179. K.P., Canto 1, vs.164 and 165.

180. Ibid., vs. 166 and 167.

CHAPTER - VII

181. K. P., Ed. by Sūryanārāyana Sastri pp., 29 -30.

182. K. P., Ed. by M. S. pp., 179 - 181.

183. సీ. హుంకారములతోడ నుచ్చాటనపు బద
నికలీఁగ తఱుటునన్ వ్రేసి వ్రేసి
కడు ధాక మీఱంగ మడములు తాపించు
చును మందఱికి లివ చూపి చూపి
మొగము పార్శ్వములకు మగడింపకుఁడ వా
కట్టుమూలిక వాగెఁ బట్టి పట్టి
వడి సూర్త్యగతిని లేవకయుండఁ దన నాగ
బెత్తాన మూర్ధంబు మొత్తి మొత్తి

గీ. సిద్ధుఁ డధిక ప్రయత్న సన్నద్ధుఁడగుచు
నెంత చేసిన నాసింహ మెదుటి కడుగు
పెట్టదయ్యెను గర్వావిభీషణ ముగఁ
దోఁకఁ ద్రిప్పుచుఁ గడు వెన్కఁ ద్రొక్కుఁ గాని

కళాపూ., ఆ 3, ప. 86

184. ఈముందరి నికటంబునంద మృగేంద్రవాహన యను శక్తి గలదు.
తన్మందిరంబు మందఱ సున్న మృగేంద్రంబునకుఁ గ్రింద మీఁదం
జుట్టుపట్టున నెట్టి బెట్టిదంపు సింగంబులుం జన వెఱచు నిది మఱచి
యే నెంత తోలిన మన వాహనం బచటి కట్టెదురు నడమ.

కళా పూ , ఆ 3, వ. 90

185. K.P., Canto 4, vs.47and 48

186. Ibid., Canto 3, v.91.

187. Ibid., pr.276.

188. అనుటయు నట్ల తప్ప దనుచు నవ్వి యువ్వసుమతీ ధవుఁడు నమ్మధుర లాలస నాలోకించి
యో బాలికాతిలకంబ యీ సందియంబు దీఱ నీ బ్రాహ్మణుని జన్మాదివర్తనంబు నితనికిఁ
బ్రథమాగమాదులు పుత్రులైన ప్రకారంబును వారు మదాశయునకుఁ బురోహితు లైన
తెఱంగును నెఱింగింపు మనిన నట్ల సేసెద నని యబ్బాల యిట్లని చెప్పె.

189. ఆస్తాం వస్తుషు వైదగ్ధ్యం కావ్యే కామపి వక్రతామ్,
ప్రధాన సంవిధానాంక నామ్నాపి కురుతే కవిః.

వక్రోక్తి 4.24.

190. K.S., Canto 1, sl.26.

191. K.P., Canto 5, pr.46.

192. S, D., Chapt.7, Dōsaprakaraṇa, Ds.12-15.

193. సందర్భేషు దశరూపకం శ్రేయః. తద్ధిచిత్రం, చిత్రపటవ ద్విశేష
సాకల్యాత్. తతోన్య భేదకౢప్తిః – తతో దశరూపకా దన్యేషాం
భేదానాం కౢప్తిః కల్పన మితి. దశరూపకస్యహి ఇదం సర్వం
విలసితం. యదుత కథాఖ్యాయికే మహాకావ్య మితి.

Kayuālankārasūtravrtti, 1 - 3, 30 - 32.

194. Aesthetic, pp., 190 - 191.

195. K.P., Canto 2, vs. 50 - 51.

196. K.P., Canto 3, v. 45.

197. Ibid., vs.51 - 52.

198. K.P., Canto 3, vs.48, 50 & 51.

199. క్రోధ ప్రసాద శోకాః శాపోత్సర్గో ధ విద్రోవోద్వాహా
అద్భుత సంభవ దర్శన మంకే ప్రత్యక్షజాని స్యుః. 20
ఏక దివసప్రవృత్తం కార్య స్త్వంకేర్థ బీజ మధిక్యత్య
ఆవశ్యక కార్యాణా మవిరోధేన ప్రయోగేషు. 21
ఏకాంకే న కదాచి ద్బహూని కార్యాణి యాజయే ద్ధీమాన్
ఆవశ్యకావిరోధేన తత్ర కార్యాణి కార్యాణి. 22
న బహూ నీహ కార్యాణి త్వేకాంకే వినియోజయేత్,
ఆవశ్యకానాం, కార్యాణాం విరోధోహి తథా భవేత్. 24
అంకచ్ఛేదం కృత్వా మాసకృతం వర్ష సంచితం వాపి,
తత్సర్వం కర్తవ్యం వర్షా దూర్ధ్వం నతు కదాచిత్. 31
యః కశ్చి త్కార్యవశా ద్గచ్ఛతి పురుషః ప్రకృష్ట మధ్వానమ్,
తత్రా ప్యంకచ్ఛేదః కర్తవ్యః పూర్వవత్తద్ జ్ఞైః. 32

న వధః కర్తవ్యః స్యా ద్యోభ్యుదయీ నాయకః ఖ్యాతః 39

అపసరణ మేవ కార్యం గ్రహణంవా సంధి రేవవా యోజ్యః. 40

N.S., Chapt.,18.

200. మీయమ్మ శాపంబునకు నోఁ గా దన నెవ్వరికి నెట్లు వచ్చు నది యట్లనుభవించి తదనంతరజన్మంబున మదాశయుం డను జగతీ పతికి మధురలాలస యనం దనయయై జనియించి కళాపూర్ణుండను రాజునకు భార్యయై యనన్య సాధారణంబైన యైశ్వర్యభోగంబు లనుభవించుచు సహజం బైన పరమపాతివ్రత్యంబున సకలధర్మంబులు సాధించి కృతార్థవయ్యెదు. విచారింపకు మని వారిజాస నుండు పలికిన శారద యవ్విభునిం జూచి యిది యేమయ్యా వెండియు మదాశయుండును మధురలాలసయును గళాపూర్ణుండు నంచుఁ బల్కు చున్నవారు. బలికి నవ్విన నతండు భవదీయవదన వర్ణనా సంబంధి కథలయందు నాకుఁ గలవరింతలు సంతతంబును గలుగుట సహజంబయ్యైన నిది యట్లు గాదు మేదినిమీఁద నింకఁ గళాపూర్ణుండను రాజు పుట్టఁగలం డతని కిది పత్నియుఁ గాఁగల దనుటయు నేఁ దత్కథ వినవలయు నానతిమ్మని సరస్వతి పల్కిన నిట్లనియె.

K.P.,Canto 5, pr.59.

CHAPTER - VIII

201. ప్రారంభశ్చ ప్రయత్నశ్చ తథా ప్రాప్తేశ్చ సంభవః,
నియతాచ ఫలప్రాప్తిః ఫలయోగశ్చ పంచమః.

(కాశీ) నాట్యశాస్త్ర. అ. 21.

202. ఔత్సుక్యమాత్రబంధస్తు య ద్బీజస్య నిబధ్యతే,
మహతః ఫలయోగస్య స స్వల్పారంభ ఇష్యతే.
అపశ్యతః ఫలప్రాప్తి వ్యాపారో యః ఫలంప్రతి,
పరం చౌత్సుక్యగమనం స ప్రయత్నః ప్రకీర్తితః.
ఈషత్ప్రాప్తిర్య యా కాచిత్ అర్థస్య పరికల్పతే,
భావమాత్రేణసంజ్ఞేయో విధిజ్ఞైః ప్రాప్తి సంభవః.
నియతాంచ ఫలప్రాప్తి ర్యత్ర భావేన పశ్యతి,
నియతాం తాం ఫలప్రాప్తిం సగుణాస్తు వినిర్దేశేత్.
అభిప్రేతం సమగ్రం చ ప్రతిరూపం క్రియఫలం
య ద్దృశ్యతే నివృత్తేతు ఫలయోగః స ఉచ్యతే.

(కాశీ) నాట్యశాస్త్ర. అ. 21.

203. బీజ బిందు పతాకాఖ్యా ప్రకరీ కార్యలక్షణాః,
అర్థప్రకృతయః పంచ తా ఏతాః పరికీర్తితాః.
అర్థప్రకృతయః ప్రయోజన సిద్ధి హేతవః

దశరూపక. ప్రకాశ 1, శ్లో. 18.

204. అల్పమాత్రం సముత్సృష్టం బహుధా యత్ప్రసర్పతి,
ఫలావసానం యచ్చైవ బీజం త దభిధీయతే.
ప్రయోజనానాం విచ్ఛేదే య దవిచ్ఛేద కారణమ్,
యావ త్సమాప్తి ర్బంధస్య స బిందు రితి సంజ్ఞితః.
య ద్వృత్తం హి పరార్థం స్యాత్ ప్రధానస్యోపకారకమ్
ప్రధానవచ్చ కల్ప్యేత సా పతాకేతి కీర్తితా.
ఫలం సకల్ప్యతే సద్భిః పరార్థం యస్య కేవలం,
అనుబంధేన హీనస్య ప్రకరీం తాం వినిర్దిశేత్.
య దాధికారికం యస్తు సమ్యక్ ప్రాజ్ఞైః ప్రయుజ్యతే,
తదర్థోయః సమారంభ స్తత్కార్యం సముదాహృతమ్

నాట్యశాస్త్ర అ. 21.

300

అన్యేతు, యద్ధి నాటకార్థస్య ప్రవృత్తిభూత మవమానోత్సా
హాభ్యాం ప్రత్యంగం పరికీర్త్యతే స బిందుః యథా రాఘవా
భ్యుదయే కేకయ్యాః ప్రత్యంక ముత్కీర్తనం, వేణ్యాంచ కీర్త్యతే
ద్రౌపదీ కేశకర్షణం, ఉత్సాహే నాగానందే జీమూతవాహనస్య
సర్వాంకే కీర్తన మితి. స చ కార్యస్య సమాప్తిం యావత్
ప్రవర్తయితవ్యః.

205. See foot note 220.

206. Bhāvaprakāsana Adhikara, 7.
అవిచ్ఛేదాయ రచయేద్బిందుం మధ్యేతయో (బీజకార్యయో) రపి.

207. సానుబంధం పతాకాఖ్యం, ప్రకరీచ ప్రదేశభాక్.
దూరం య దన్వర్తతే ప్రాసంగికం సా పతాకా. సుగ్రీవాది
వృత్తాంతవత్.
పతాకేవా సాధారణ నాయక చిహ్న వత్తదుప కారిత్వాత్.
య దల్పం సా ప్రకరీ. శ్రావణాదివృత్తాంతవత్.

దశరూపక ప్రకాశ. 1.13.

For further explanation of the distinction between *pataka* and *prakari* see pages 235 - 236.

208. అంతరైకార్థ సంబంధః సంధి రేకాన్వయే సతి.
ఏకేన ప్రయోజనే నాన్వితానాం కథాంశానా మవాంతరైక
ప్రయోజన సంబంధః సంధిః.

దశరూపక. ప్ర. 1.

209. యత్ర బీజసముత్పత్తి ర్నా నార్థ రససంభవా,
కావ్యే శరీరానుగతం త న్ముఖం పరికీర్తితం.

నాట్యశాస్త్ర. అ 21.

210. బీజస్యోద్ఘాటనం యత్తు దృష్టనష్ట మివ క్వచిత్,
ముఖే న్యస్తస్య సర్వత్ర తద్వై ప్రతిముఖం భవేత్.

211. ఉద్భేద స్తస్య బీజస్య ప్రాప్తి రప్రాప్తి రేవ వా,
పున శ్చా న్వేషణం యత్ర స గర్భ ఇతి సంజ్ఞితః.

212. గర్భనిర్భిన్న బీజార్థో విలోభనకృతోపివా,
కించి దాశ్లేషసంయుక్తో విమర్శః స ఇతి స్మృతః.

213. సమానంచ సమర్థానాం ముఖ్యార్థానాం సబీజి నాం,
ఫలోపసంగ తా నాంచ జ్ఞేయం నిర్వహణంతు తత్.

214& 215. K.P., Canto 3, vs.61, 62and 67.

216 ప్రయత్నస్తు తదప్రాప్తౌ వ్యాపారోతిత్వరాన్వితః.

దశరూపక. ప్రకాశ 1. 20

217. K.P., Canto 4, Pr.183 and v.185.

218. Ibid., Canto 6, pr.187.

219. Ibid., Canto 1, v.149.

220. ఫల బిందుం లక్షయతి ప్రయోజనానామవిచ్ఛేద ఇతి. ప్రయుజ్యతే
ఫలం యస్మై రూపాయానుష్ఠానే తేషాం, ఇతివృత్తవశా దవశ్య
మంతర్వ్యాధి ర్విచ్ఛేదేపి సతి య దనుసంధానాత్మకం ప్రధాన
నాయకగతం సంధి .... వ్యజ్ఞానబిందుర్ జ్ఞాత విచారణం ఫల
లాభోపాయిత్వాత్. యావ దవిచ్ఛేదః ప్రత్యనుసంధానేన న
క్రియత స్తావ న్న కించి దపి కార్యం నిర్వహతి.

అభినవభారతి 19,

Quoted by the author of Comparative Aesthetic,

221. సానుబంధం పతాకాఖ్యం, ప్రకరీవ ప్రదేశభాక్.

దశరూపక. ప్రకాశ 1, శ్లో 13

222. There is a difference of opinion regarding the *pratımukha sandhi*. According to Dhananjaya the development must be partly perceptible and partly imperceptible (లక్ష్యాలక్ష్యతయోద్భేదస్తస్య ప్రతిముఖం భవేత్. Dasarupaka Prakasa 1, sl.11.) But Abhinavagupta does not accept this. According to him the various *sandhis* represent the differnt states of the seed and the visiblity is the only thing to be presented in the *pratimukha*.

బీజస్య ఉద్ఘాటనం యత్రేతి. కార్యతయా దృష్టం కారణతయా నష్టమితి కేచిత్. ఉపాదేయే దృష్టం ప్రతినాయకే నష్ట మిత్యపరే. న చైత త్సమంజసమ్. ఏక విషయతా మంతరేణ సంధానయోగాత్. నాశస్యాపిచ హేయాదివిషయస్య ప్రారంభ వశేన దృష్టతయైవ పద్గ్రహాసంపత్తేః (?). తస్మా దయ మర్థః. బీజస్య ఉద్ఘాటనం తావ త్ఫలానుగుణో దశావిశేష స్త దదృష్ట మపి విరోధి సన్నిధేర్నష్ట మివ పాంసునా పిహితస్యేవ బీజ స్యాంకుర రూప ముద్ఘాటనమ్.

అభినవభారతి అ. 19, ప. 40.

223. గర్భస్తు దృష్టస్య బీజస్య అన్వేషణ మాహుః,
ద్వాదశాంగః పతాకా స్యాన్న వాస్యాత్ప్రాప్తి సంభవః.

దశరూపకము. ప్రకాశ 1. 36

224. S.D., Pariccheda 6, Karikas 79 - 80.

225. D.R. mentions *sama* in the place of *tapana* and defines it as *aratisama* S.D. defines that, when one finds no way out, it is acase of tapana.

226. This is defined as *sancintyamanapti* by *Dhananjaya*, and as knowing the feelings of others by Visvantha. The example given here is in accordance with the latter interpretation.

227. Ibid., Canto 3., v.284.
Not included by the Dasarupaka.

228. Ibid., Canto 3., pr.246.
This is mentioned as *ksipti* in the Sāhityadarpana.

229. K.P, Canto 3., v.262.
The Daśarūpaka mentions it as *sambhrama*. The Sahityadarpana defines it as commotion (వేగిరపాటు) due to doubt, fear and alarm.

229-a. Dhananjaya defines this quite differently when he says: విద్రవోవధబంధాదిః.

What Bharata calls *vidrava* becomes drava in Dhananjaya's Daśarūpaka. *Khēda* to be found in the Nātyasāstra and Sāhityadarpana is missing in the Daśarupaka and in its place there is *vidrava* with a different meaning. The example is cited in accordance with the definition of Bharata.

230. The Sahityadarpana mentions this as *pratiṣēdha* while Dhananjaya calls it vicalana and defines it as *vikatthama* or self-praise.

231. This is mentioned as *pūrvabhāva* by the Daśarūpaka.

233. S.D., paricchēda, 3, Darika 32.

D.r., Ch. 2sls.4&5.

K.A.S., Canto 2, v. 4.

K.C., Canto 3, v. 5.

234. త్రివిధ శ్చాత్ర విధిజ్ఞైః పృథక్ పృథక్ కార్యయోగ విహితార్థః,
త్రివిధాకృతిశృంగారో జ్ఞేయో ధర్మార్థ కామకృతః
యత్ర తు ధర్మే ప్రార్థితమాత్రం హితం భవతి సాధితంబహుధా
వ్రతనియమ తపోయుక్తం జ్ఞేయో సౌ ధర్మశృంగారః
స్త్రీ సంప్రయోగ విషయే వ్యయధార్థ మపీష్య తేభిరతిః.
కన్యావిలోభనం వా ప్రాప్తం స్త్రీ పుంసయోస్తు రమ్యం వా,
నిభృతం వా సావేగం జానీయాత్ కామశృంగారం.

Kası Ed. Nātyasāstra, Ch.20 vs.76-79.

A different version is to be found in Kāvyamāla edition:-

త్రివిధ శ్చాత్ర విధిజ్ఞైః పృథక్ పృథక్ కార్యయోగ విహితార్థః,
శృంగారః కర్తవ్యో ధర్మేచార్థే వ కామేచ,
యత్ర తు ధర్మం సమాపక మాత్మహితం భవతి సాధనం బహుదా
వ్రతనియమ తపోయుక్తో జ్ఞేయో సౌ ధర్మశృంగారః
స్త్రీ సంప్రయోగ విషయే వ్యయధార్థ మపీష్య తే హిరతిః.
కన్యావిలోభనకృతం ప్రాప్తౌ స్త్రీ పుంసయోస్తు రమ్యం వా,
నిభృతం సావేగం వా యస్య భవే ద్వా కామశృంగారః

235. అనుచిత విభావాలంబనత్వం రసాభాసత్వమ్.

Rasagangadhara, Anana 1

236. శృంగారం త్రివిధం విద్యాత్ వా ఙ్నేపథ్య క్రియాత్మకం
అంగ నేపథ్యవాక్యైశ్చ హాస్య రౌద్రౌ త్రిధా స్మృతౌ.
ధర్మోపఘాతజ శ్చైవ తథాన్యపచయోద్భవః,
తథా శోకకృతశ్చైవ కరుణ స్త్రివిధః స్మృతః.
దానవీరం ధర్మవీరం యుద్ధవీరం తథైవచ,
రసవీర మపి ప్రాహు స్తద్ జ్ఞా స్త్రివిధసమ్మతం
వ్యాజాచ్చై వాపరాధాచ్చ విత్రాసితక మేవచ,
పున ర్భయానకం చాపి విద్యాత్ త్రివిధ మేవ చ
బీభత్సః క్షోభజః శుద్ధ ఉద్వేగీ స్యా త్తృతీయకః,
విష్టాకృమిభి రుద్వేగీ క్షోభజో రుధిరాదిజః.
దివ్య శ్చానందజశ్చైవ ద్విధా ఖ్యాతాద్భుతో రసః,
దివ్యదర్శనజో దివ్యో హర్షా దానందజః స్మృతః.

Kasi Ed.,N.S.Chapt.6,vs.77-82.

While Bhārata states that *adbhuta* is of three kinds,Viśvāntha and others hold that is is of four kinds. See S.D.,Chap.3,Kārika 234.

304

237. The author of the Rasagangādhara maintains that the statement that vira is of four kinds only is not comprehensive. He illustrates *satyavīra, pāṇḍitya-vīra, kṣhama-vīra* and *bala-vīra*

238. S.D.,Chapt.3,Ks.214-216.

239. అథ హాస్యో నామ హాసస్థాయి భావాత్మకః. స చ వికృతవేషా
లంకార ధార్ష్ట్య లౌల్య కలహాసత్ప్రలాప వ్యంగ్య దర్శన
దోషోదాహరణాదిభి ర్విభావైః సముత్పద్యతే. తస్యోష్ఠ దంశన
నాసా కపోలస్పందన దృష్టివ్యాకోశాకుంచన స్వేదాస్యరాగ
పార్శ్వగ్రహణాదిభి రనుభావైః. వ్యభిచారిణ శ్చా . . చాస్య
అవహిత్థాలస్యతంద్రా నిద్రా స్వప్న ప్రబోధాసూయాదయః

(నా.) నాట్య. – 3. పే 74.

240. Kasi Ed.N.S., Chapt.3, p.74.
Rasarnavasudhakara, vilasa 2. sl.160.

241. K.P., canto 1, pr.9and 11.

242. ఇత్యాద్య శేషమిహవస్తు విశేషజాతం
రామాయణాదిచ విభావ్య బృహత్కధాంచ।
ఆసూత్రయేత్తదను నేత్రరసానుగుణ్యాత్
చిత్రం కధా ముచితచారువచః ప్రపంచః॥
నకేవలం రసో నైవలక్ష్యం నైవచలక్షణమ్।
ననాయకస్త్యైవోత్కర్షో వర్ణ్యః సుకవినాక్వచిత్॥
కధా శరీరం సర్వేషామానుగుణ్యేన కల్పయేత్॥

ఇతి భావప్రకాశనే సప్తమోధికారః.

243. This and some other qualities mentioned here are not discussed for want of space.

244. For the author's explanation of these gunas one may refer to the Appendix 2.

245. K.P., Canto 1, v.188.

246. K.P., Canto 2, v.3.

247. K.P., Canto 4, vs.61 - 64

248. K.P., Canto 1, vs.188 & 190
It is well known that, Sūrana has created another poet through the character of Suchimukhi in the Prabhāvatīpradyumnam.
1. వాసనా వేదాంతసి ప్రాక్తనీచ. రసాస్వాద హేతుః.
తత్ర యద్యాద్యా నస్యాత్ తదా శ్రోత్రియ జరన్మీమాం
సకాదీనా మపి నస్యాత్.   S. D., Chapt 6.

249. K.P., Canto 1, v.204; Canto 5. pr.70

250. Kasi Ed.N.S., Chapt.1, sl.11-114.

251. అచింత్యో హి మణి మంత్రౌషధీనాం ప్రభావః
Ratnavali, Act 2.
N.K.S., canto 10,vs.10,12.

252. Kası Ed., N.S., Chapt.1-109, 116, 118.

253. Ibid., Chapt.21 - 121, 125, 128.

254 This is akin to Aristotle's definition of poetry as imitation of life but not identical with it because of the philosphical differences. Bharata there is reason to believe,has closer affinites with Sānkhya system than with Kāshmir saivism, which abhinavagupta unjustifiable reads into the Nātyasāstra. For a detailed study of Aristotle's theory of Imitation, the author's essay may be consulted.

255. Not to be confused with the Sanskrit term, manas.

256. It is a land which has given birth to Kāshmir Saivism which is quite distinct from Advaita and which takes strong objection to the latter's conception of Māya, Isvara and the world.

257. Tradition as recorded by Virēśalingam Pantulu indicates

that Sūrana, when he was quite young, fled form his native county to Kāsi and got himself educted there. Does Manikandhara's Visit to Kāśhmir in any way suggest the possiblity of the poet's visit to that country? This will only be a conjecture ur before him definite historical data.

258. K.P., Canto 4, vs.. Canto 4, V.114.

259. Ibid., Canto 8, V.:

260. D.T V., p., 246.

261. Ibid., p., 146.

262. Ibid., pp., 145 - 146.

263. Introduction to K.P.by M.S., pp., 11 - 12.

264. For a detailed study of the conection between epistemolgy and aesthetics,one may consult the author's Jēgantalu,parts 1 & 3 and the follwing section of this Thesis.

265. V.j., p., 245.

CHAPTER - X

266 Introduction to K.P.Ed.by M.S., pp., 11 - 12

267. R.p., Avatārika V.1.

268. Ibid., vs.2, 41 - 48.

269. జనముల్ మెచ్చఁగ ము న్రచించితి నుదంచ ద్వైఖరిం గారుడం
బును శ్రీరాఘవపాండవీయముఁ గళాపూర్ణోదయంబు న్మతి
స్తైనుఁగుం గబ్బము లెన్ని యేనియును మత్ప్రోత్రాదిపింకాధి వ
ర్ణన లేమిం బరితుష్టి నా కవి యొనర్తాం జాల వత్యంతమున్

ప్ర. ప్ర. ఆ. 1, ప 6.

270 పే ర్వేలయుంగ నాఘనుఁడు పింగళి గోపయభొత్తముండు గం
ధర్వ సౌందర్యుఁ జేసి యనువానిని వాసిగ నేలి యోగితా
గర్వసుధాపుఁడై నెరపె గోపకుమారునిబద్ధపక్షసం
బర్వపునందు పెన్మైలపై నెఁ జూపెడు కీర్తిపంపుచున్

271. వారలకు నగ్రజుం డగు
నారయ నారప్రభుండు సుపవిత్రసదా
చార శివభక్తి వినతో
దారత్వముచేఁ బ్రసిద్ధతముఁడై మించెన్
శ్రీమ ద్రాజేంద్ర గురు
స్వామి స్థిర వంశ కలశజలనిధిసోమ
త్స్వామారాధ్య ప్రాపం
బ్రామిల శివభక్తి శోభితాచార్యుఁడున్.

272. అబ్బాంబాపతుఁ డఖిలా
పబ్బాంధవ దివ్య కీర్తిపుడు నరసిద
త్రాప్పింము సము ప్రఖ్యాతి
షుపోషముయాత్మతత్త్వ కోవిదుఁడు మహిన్.

274. నెన్నడుము పేరి మించు నన్నాఁటలతవోడ్డు
పొన్నవిరి నిక్కముగఁ జూచి చెన్నఁ బోదు
రఘకుసుమ సౌరభ సాధనార్థ హేతు
వా శ్రయమాసిక్త మనియెడి యయ్య తెల్ల.

This regfernce to logicians should not be taken as disregard for them by the poet. See the following:-

కాణాదంబును గౌతమీయమును సాంఖ్యంబున్ భుజంగాగ్రణీ
వాణీమార్గము జైమినీయమతమున్ వ్యాసోక్తశాస్త్రంబు వ
క్కాణించెన్ గడు పూర్వపక్షములు జోకం బెంచుచు న్నెంచి యు
క్షీణప్రౌఢిఁ దిరస్కరింపుచుఁ దుదున్ సిద్ధాంతముల నిల్పుచున్.
స్వమతిప్రౌఢి ధృఢానుమానముల సంస్థాపించు నేవేళ నె
ద్ది మతం బప్పుడు వానివానికి నుపాధిగ్రస్తతావ్యాప్తిభం
గ ముఖానేక సుదూషణంబులు వేసం గల్పించుఁ దా నన్య శా
స్త్రమతస్థాపన వేళ నవ్విహగి దైత్య శ్రేష్ఠుఁ డోహో యనన్.

275. P.P., 2 - 107.

276. K.P., Canto 4, vs.33, 34, 37 and the whole of Laksmi-Nārāyana-Samvāda in Canto 8. These verses and the episode can never be expected from the pen of an Advaitin.

CHAPTER - XI

277. Y, M.d.4, 62.

278. అనుభూతిత్వం నామవర్తమానదశాయాం స్వసత్తయైవ స్వాశ్రయం
ప్రతి ప్రకాశమానత్వం, స్వసత్తయైవ స్వవిషయ సాధనత్వం వా.
Y. M. D. 6-1. See V. S. 1-1-1.

279. Ibid. సర్వం జ్ఞానం స్వత ఏవ ప్రమాణం స్వయంప్రకాశం చ.

280. Ibid.,7-4.

281. ద్రవ్య ముపాదానమ్. అవస్థాశ్రయ ముపాదానం.
గుణాశ్రయో ద్రవ్యమితి సామాన్యలక్షణం సంభవతి.

282. సంయోగ రహిత మద్రవ్యమ్

283. ఆత్మగుణభూతస్య జ్ఞానస్య ద్రవ్యత్వం కథ మితి న శంకనీయం.
ప్రభావత్ ఏకస్యైవ ద్రవ్యత్వ గుణత్వయో ర్విరోధాభావాత్.
అవస్థాశ్రయో ద్రవ్య మితి ద్రవ్యలక్షణం. స్వాశ్రయా దన్యత్ర
వర్తమానత్వ మపి ప్రభావత్ ఏవోపపద్యతే.

ప్రయోగశ్చ – గుణభూతా బుద్ధిర్ద్రవ్యం ప్రసరణాదిమత్వాత్.

ప్రభావత్ ''జ్ఞానం ద్రవ్యం, సంయోగాద్యాశ్రయత్వేసతి భావనా

కారణత్వాత్, ఆత్మవత్,'' ఇతి.

Y.M.D., 7-19.

284. Y.M.d., 7 11 to 13.

285. అతః సర్వం విజ్ఞానజాతం యథార్థ మితి సిద్ధం.

శ్రీభాష్యమ్ 1-1-1.

286. Y.M.D., 1-25.

287. Br.Up.IV, iii, 1

288. Y.M.D., 1-26; S.B.E.Vol.48, p.120; V.S.3-2-3.

289. Ibid., 1 - 27.

290. యథావస్థిత వ్యవహారానుగుణజ్ఞానం ప్రమా.

Y.M D., 1-7.

291. అత్ర సాక్షాత్కార ప్రమాకరణం ప్రత్యక్షం.

Y.M.D., 1-12.

292. Y.M.D., 1-14

293. Ibid., 1-17.

295. అస్మాకం త్వనియమః క్వచిత్ పంచావయవః, క్వచి త్త్ర్యవ యవః, క్వచి ద్ద్వ్యవయవః.

Y. M. D. 2-30

296. Y.M.D.2-41.

297. V S., 1-2-1.

298. Ibid.1-1-3.

299. Ibid.1 - 2 - 23.

300. Y.M.D.4-10

301. Y.M.D.4-24

302. Y.M.D.7-17 to 21.

303. Y.M.D.8-1

304. S.B.E.Vol.XLVIII p.565.

305. ఈశ్వరస్యైవ జీవానా మపి నిత్యం జ్ఞానం స్వతశ్చ సర్వవిషయ ప్రమాత్మకం చత త్తత్కర్మాది దోషవశాత్ సంకుచితవిషయం.

వేదాంతదేశిక

306. ఏతేన జ్ఞానస్య క్షణికత్వాత్ క్షణిక సంతానరూప ఆత్మేతి బౌద్ధ పక్షః; భూతచతుష్టయాత్మకత్వాత్ దేహస్య దేహోవధిక ఆత్మేతి చార్వాకపక్షః; గజదేహే గజపరిమాణః, పిపీలికాదేహే తత్పరి మాణః; అతో దేహ పరిమాణ ఆత్మేతి జైనపక్షః; కర్తృత్వ భోక్తృత్వాదికం ప్రకృతే రేవ నతు పురుషస్యేతి సాంఖ్యపక్షః; బ్రహ్మాంశో జీవ ఇతి యాదవపక్షః; సోపాధిబ్రహ్మఖండో జీవ ఇతి భాస్కరపక్షః; అవిద్యాకల్పిత ఏక జీవవాదపక్షః అంతః కరణావ చ్ఛిన్నానేక జీవవాదపక్ష ఇ త్యేవ మాదయో విరుద్ధపక్షా నిరస్తాః విభుత్వ వాదపక్షోపి.

Y.M.D.8-9

307. బ్రహ్మణో భావః నతు స్వరూపైక్యమ్.

308. Sribhāsya, 2-3-18

309. Y.M.D., 9-13.See S.B.E. Vol.48 p.463.

310. Ibid., 9-11.

311. Ibid., 9-14, 15.

310 312. Y.M.D.8-18

313. Ibid., 9-19.

314. Ibid., 9-22.

315. Ibid., 9-26.

316. Ibid., 9-27.

317. Jēgantalu, part I by the present writer.

318. Vēdāntapancadasi, Chapt.6, S.235.

319. S.B.E., Vol.48, p.638.

320. ఈశ్వరానుమానికత్వం.... నాస్మాభిః స్వీక్రియతే.

Y.M.D.,1-40

321. Br.Up.7 - 24 -1.

322. Y.M.D., 9 - 18.

323. Ibid., 9 - 19.

324. Ibid., 9 - 22.

325. Ibid., 9 - 26.

326. Ibid., 27.

327. జగద్వ్యాపారవర్జనస్య ప్రతిపాదనాత్ తస్య నానాత్వం సర్వలోక సంచరణం చ సంభవతి.

Y.M.D.,8-24.

328. Ândhra Bhāgavatam, Intro., V.18.

329. The Philosophy of the Beautyiful, p.102.

330. P.M., Canto V.216.

331, Bhagavata, 10-29-15.

332. Rasagangādhara mentions as many as eight interpreations on *rasa sutra*, see p.26-34.

333. N.S., Chapt.6, SI.6.

334. అత ఏవ విశేషాంత రానుపహితత్వాత్ సారసనీయా సతీ, న లౌకికీతి, న మిథ్యా నా నిర్వాచ్యా న లౌకికతుల్యా న తదా రోపాదిరూపా.

A.Bh.p.

335. The opinion "భగ్నావరణచిద్విశిష్టోరత్యాదిః స్థాయిభావో రసః" is attributed to Abhinava and Mammata by Panditarāya. This is not really the opinion of Abhinava but a mere allegation of the former owing to his misunderstanding. This can be clearly seen even from Āndhra Dhvanyālōka where in sri Vedala Tiruvengalacharyulu has given a correct exposition of Abhinava's *rasa* theory.

336. సముచిత లలిత సన్నివేశాచారుణా కావ్యేన సమర్పితైః సహృదయ హృదయం ప్రవిష్టైః తదీయసహృదయతా సహకృతేన భావనా విశేషమహిమ్నా విగలిత దుష్యంత రమణీయత్వాదిభిః, అలౌకిక విభావానుభావ వ్యభిచారి శబ్ద వ్యపదేశ్యైః శకుంతలాదిభి రాలంబనాకారణైః చంద్రికాదిభి రుద్దీపనకారణైః అశ్రుపాతాదిభిః కార్యైః చింతాదిభిః సహకారిభిశ్చ సంభూయ ప్రాదుర్భావితేన అలౌకికేన వ్యాపారేణ, తత్కాల నివర్తి తానందాంశావరణా జ్ఞానేన అత ఏవ ప్రమృష్ట పరిమిత ప్రమాతృత్వాది నిజ ధర్మేణ ప్రమాత్రస్వప్రకాశతయా వాస్తవేన నిజస్వరూపానందేన సహ గోచరీక్రియమాణః ప్రాగ్వినివిష్టవాసనారూపః రత్యాది రేవరసః.

రసగంగాధరము, ప్ర. ఆ.

337. రంగ రజతాదీ నా మివ, స్వప్న తురగాదీ నా మివ సాక్షిభాస్యత్వ మవిరుద్ధం.

338. For a detailed study of the differences between the two experiences arising from a work of Art and a dream, the present writer's essay, Kavyajagattu, may be consulted.

339. A.Bh.Vol.1, p.3.

340. R.G.,C.1-17,

341. Here it is not meant that there is no place for beauty in the scheme of Advaita. What is suggested is that Beauty one comes across ina work of art is, according to Advaita,as unreal and transitory as Isvara whose nature has been explained before. This transitory value given to Isvara etc. alone, it seems, has been the cause for dissatisfaction among great scholars like Maxmuller who plainly remarks:- "It must be clear to every one who has once mastered the frame work of the true Vēdānta philosophy as I have tried to explain it, that there is really but little room in it for pshychology or cosmology, nay, even for ethics." (Six systems of Indian Philosophy, p., 170.)

342. R.G.pp.8 - 9.

వాక్యం రసాత్మకం కావ్యం – S D

343. న హి తచ్ఛూన్యం కావ్యం కించి దస్తి

344. ప్రాధాన్యాదితి–రసపర్యవసానాదిత్యర్థః. తానన్మాత్ర విశ్రాంతా వపి చాన్యశబ్ద వైలక్షణ్య కారిత్వేన వస్త్వలంకారధ్వనే రపి జీవితత్వ మౌచిత్యా దుక్త మితి భావః.

లోపనము పేజి 2

345. ఆర్ద్రతాస్థాయికః స్నేహ రస ఇతి త్వసత్ స్నేహో హ్యభిషంగః. సచ సర్వో రత్యుత్సాహదా వేవ పర్యవస్యతి. తథాహి మాతా పిత్రాదౌ స్నేహః భయే విశ్రాంతః యూనోః మిత్రజనే రతౌ లక్ష్మణాదేః భ్రాతరి స్నేహః ధర్మవీర ఏవ. ఏవం వృద్ధస్య పుత్రాదా వపి ద్రష్టవ్యం ఏతేనైవ గర్భస్థాయికస్య లౌల్యరసస్య ప్రత్యాఖ్యానే సరణి ర్మంతవ్యా హాసేహా రతావా అన్యత్ర పర్యవసానాత్. ఏవం భక్తా వపి వాచ్య మితి.

A. Bh. Vol. 1.

నను వాత్సల్యం, లౌల్యం, భక్తిః కార్పణ్యం వా కథం న రసః, అర్థలాభిలాష శ్రద్ధాస్పృహాణాం స్థాయిభావానాం తత్ర సత్త్వాదితి చేత్ న తేషాం వ్యభిచారిరత్యాత్మకత్వాత్. నను కస్య రసస్య వ్యభిచారిణో భవేయుః ఇతిచేత్ సత్యం, వాత్సల్యే కరుణ ఏవ రసో లౌల్యే హాస్యో భక్తౌ శాంతః కార్పణ్యే హాస్య ఏవ

రసతరంగిణీ. భానుదత్త.

346. This view finds a vigorous protagonist in Prof.solomon E.Asch when he writes in his social Psycholoty:-

"Traditional instinct-habit psycholgies have little of relevance to say about the specific properties of human orientation; they give the appearance of having solved the problem of social life when they have simply by-passed them. In particular, they do not face seriously the problems of order in individual and social action when they describe men as a sum of instincts and habits. A psychology of drives and habits can hardly find a conceptional place for psychological structures most characteristic of man-for the reality of a self, of kinship relation, or a sense or values. It results in the description of an individual who is not capable of novelty,who is a genuinely social being but is only a more complicated form of pre-social, pre-human individual. It is a crude fallacy to assume that no changes occur in the social field other than the detailed modifications in the sequence and arrangement of elementary functions. We must keep open the view that many distinctive psychological operations take form only within a social field and that the changes they produce alter individuals at their centre. (pp.78-79.)

For an elaborate criticism of the theory of Instincts L.L.Bernard's Book, Instincts, may be consulted.

347. R.G.pp.45 - 46.

348. అయి. చలువ గల వెన్నెలల చెలువునకు సౌరభము
గలిగినను సౌరభము, జలువయుఁ దలిర్పం
బొలుపెసఁగు కప్పురపుఁ [illegible] గోమలత
నెలకొనిన సౌరభముఁ జలువ పసయుం గో
మలతయును గలిగి జగముల మిగులఁ బెంపెసఁగు
మలయపవనంపుఁ గొదమలకు మధురత్వం
బలవడిన నీడు మఱి కలదనఁగ వచ్చుఁ గడు వెలయఁ
గల యా సుకవిపలుకులకు నెంచన్.
క. పూ. ఆ 1, ప 190.

349. K.A., Pariccheda 1, sl.41.

350. నిత్య నిరవద్య నిరతిశ యౌజ్జ్వల్య సౌందర్య సౌగంధ్య సౌకు
మార్య లావణ్య యౌవన మార్దవార్జవాదయో దివ్యమంగళ
విగ్రహగుణాః.

314

352. K.P., Canto 8, 232.

353. K.P., Canto 2, v.103.

354. Ibid., Canto 4, v.31.

355. Surana takes every care not to confuse acrobatics in words with poetry by never calling the former poetry. He calles it *vākpaddhati matalacandamy* and *vicitrakavitva* as distinct from kavitva or sahitya. Does he suggest here that genuine poetry is always beyond the reach of these well -versed in the Vēdās and grammar? Does he mean to say that only *citra kavitva* will result if they indulge in it?

356. K.P.

357. Ibid., Canto 4, v.37.

358. K.P., Canto 4, v.38.

359. See foot note No.19.

361. పింగళి సూరన కళాపూర్ణోదయములో సాహిత్యలక్షణము విషయమై యంతగా చెప్పుకొనునది లేకపోయినను ప్రభావతీప్రద్యుమ్నమునందు కొంత చెప్పుకొన దలచి యుద్యమించినాడు, తన ప్రబంధములను భావించుటకు భావుకుల కెట్టి భావన యుండవలయునో యాత డందించిన సూచనను ధ్వని తత్త్వవేత్తలకు సూచనగా గుర్తింప వచ్చును.

మాధవరామశర్మ. ఆం ధ్వ. పీఠిక.

362. ఈ రెండవ కృతి (ప్రభావతీప్రద్యుమ్నము) రచించులోపల కవి కొంతమట్టునకు శైలిం గూర్చిన యభిప్రాయము మార్చినా డనియు చెప్పుట కవకాశ మున్నది. కళాపూర్ణోదయ పద్యములం బట్టి చూచినం గవి యలంకారశాస్త్రములయెడ బహు భక్తి గలవా డనియు, నర్థాలంకారములు మాత్రమేగాక శబ్దాలంకారములును అవశ్యానుష్ఠేయములు అని భావించినట్లును గానంబడుచున్నది. ప్రభావతీప్రద్యుమ్న పద్యములో నలంకారశాస్త్రముం గూర్చిన విచారచిహ్నము లెవ్వియు లేవు.......

కవిత్వతత్త్వ విచారము, పేజి 76, 77.

363. K.P., Canto 1, v.185.

364. K.P., Canto 5, pr.46

365. Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in sanskrit, pp., 33 - 35.

366. Cf Hume's sentence:-

"....All this creative power of mind amounts to no more than the faculty of compounding transposing, augmenting, or diminishing the materials afforded by the senses and experience."

The English Philosophers, pp., 593-4.

APPENDIX - 1

లింగపురాణే ఉత్తరభాగే ప్రథమోధ్యాయః

హిరణ్యగర్భో భగవాం స్తా న్నివార్య సురోత్తమాన్
కౌశికాదీన్ సమాదాయ మునీన్ ద్వై స్సమావృతః. 42

విష్ణులోకం యయౌ శీఘ్రం వాసుదేవపరాయణః
తత్ర నారాయణో దేవః శ్వేతద్వీపని వాసిభిః 43

జ్ఞానయోగేశ్వరైః సిద్ధైర్విష్ణుభక్తైః సమాహితైః
నారాయణసమై ర్దివ్యై శ్చతుర్బాహుధరైః శుభైః 44

విష్ణుచిహ్నై సమాపన్నై ర్దీప్యమానై రకల్మషైః
అష్టాశీతిసహస్రైశ్చ సేవ్యమానో మహోజనైః 45

అస్మాభి ర్నారదాద్యైశ్చ సనకాద్యై రకల్మషైః
భూతై ర్నానావిధైశ్చైవ దివ్య స్త్రీభిః సమంతతః. 46

సేవ్యమానోథ మధ్యే వై సహస్రద్వారసంవృతే
సహస్రయోజనాయామే దివ్యే మణిమయే శుభే 47

విమానే విమలే చిత్రే భద్రపీఠాసనే హరిః
లోకకార్యే ప్రసక్తానాం దత్తదృష్టిశ్చ మాధవః. 48

తస్మిన్ కాలేథ భగవాన్ కౌశికాద్యైశ్చ సంవృతః
ఆగమ్య ప్రణిపత్యాగ్రే తుష్టావ గరుడధ్వజం 49

తతో విలోక్య భగవాన్ హరి ర్నారాయణః ప్రభుః
కౌశికే త్యాహ సంప్రీత్యా తా న్సర్వాంశ్చ యథాక్రమం 50

జయఘోషో మహా నాసీ న్మహోశ్చర్యే సమాగతే
బ్రహ్మణ మాహ విశ్వాత్మా శృణు బ్రహ్మన్ మయోదితం 51

కౌశికస్య ఇమే విప్రాః సాధ్య సాధన తత్పరాః
హితాయ సంప్రవృత్తా వైకుశస్థలనివాసినః. 52

మత్కీర్తి శ్రవణే యుక్తా జ్ఞానతత్త్వార్థకోవిదాః
అనన్య దేవతాభక్తాః సాధ్య దేవా భవంత్విమే. 53

మత్సమీపే తథాన్యత్ర ప్రవేశం దేహి సర్వదా
ఏవ ముక్త్వా పున ర్దేవః కౌశికం ప్రాహ మాధవః. 54

స్వశిష్యైస్త్వం మహా ప్రాజ్ఞ దిగ్బంధో భవ మే సదా
గణాధిపత్య మాపన్నో మ త్రాహం త్వం సమాప్స్యసై. 56

తస్మిన్ క్షణే సమాపన్నా మధురాక్షర పేశలైః
విపం చీగుణత త్త్వజ్ఞై ర్వాద్య విద్యావిశారదైః 68

మందం మందస్మితా దేవీ విచిత్రాభరణాన్వితా
గాయమానా సమాయాతా లక్ష్మీ ర్విష్ణుపరిగ్రహా. 69

వృతా సహస్రకోటిభి రంగ నాభిః సమంతతః
తతో గణాధిపా దృష్ట్వా భుశుండీపరిఘాయుధాః. 70

బ్రహ్మాదీం స్తర్జయంతః స్తే మునీ న్దేవాన్ సమంతతః
ఉత్సారయంతః సంప్రాప్తా ధిష్ఠితాః సర్వతోపమాః. 71

సర్వే వయం హి నిర్యాతాః సార్థం వై బ్రహ్మణా సురైః
తస్మిన్ క్షణే సమాయాత స్తుంబురు ర్మునిసత్తమః. 72

ప్రవి వేశ సమీపం వై దేవ్యా దేవస్య చైవహి
తత్రాసీనో యథాయోగం నానామూర్త్యా సమన్వితం. 73

జగౌ కలపదం హృష్టః విపంచిం చాభ్యవాదయత్
నానారత్న సమాయుక్తై ర్దివ్యై రాభరణోత్తమైః. 74

దివ్యమాల్యై స్తథాశుభ్రైః పూజితో మునిసత్తమః
నిర్గత స్తుంబురు ర్దృష్ట్వా శ్చాన్యే చ ఋషయః సురాః. 75

దృష్ట్వా సంపూజితం యాంతం యథాయోగ మరిందమ
నారదోథ ముని ర్దృష్ట్వా తుంబురోః సత్క్రియాం హరేః. 76

శోకావిష్టేన మనసా సంతప్త హృదయేక్షణః
చింతా మాపేదివాం స్తత్ర శోకమూర్ఛాకులాత్మకః. 77

కేనాహం హి హరే ర్వ్యాస్యే యోగం దేవసమీపతః
అహో తుంబురుణా ప్రాప్తం ధిజ్ మాం మూఢం విచేతసం. 78

యోహం హరేః సన్ని కాశం భూత్వై ర్నిర్యాతితః కథం
జీవ న్యాస్యామి కుత్రాహ మహో తుంబురుణాకృతం. 79

ఇతి సంచింతయన్ విప్ర స్తప ఆస్థితవా న్మునిః
దివ్యం వర్ష సహస్రం తు నిరుచ్ఛ్వాససమన్వితః. 80

ధ్యాయ న్విష్ణు మధాధ్యాస్తే తుంబురోః సత్క్రియాం స్మరన్ 81

రోదమానో ముహుః ర్విద్వాన్ ధి జ్యా మితి స చింతయన్

తత్ర య త్కృతవా న్విష్ణు స్తత్ శృణుష్వ నరాధిప 82

ద్వితీయోధ్యాయః

మార్కండేయ ఉవాచ –

తతో నారాయణో దేవ స్తస్మై సర్వం ప్రదాయ వై

కాలయోగేన విశ్వాత్మా సమం చక్రేధ తుంబురోః. 1

నారదం మునిశార్దూల మేవం వృత్త మభూ త్పురా

నారాయణస్య గీతానాం గానం శ్రేష్ఠం పునః పునః. 2

గానేనారాధితో విష్ణుః సత్కీర్తిం జ్ఞానవర్చసీ

దదాతి తుష్టిం స్థానం చ యధాసౌ కౌశికస్య వై. 3

పద్మాక్షప్రభృతీనాం చ సంసిద్ధిం ప్రదదే హరిః

తస్మాత్త్వయా మహారాజ విష్ణుక్షేత్రే విశేషతః. 4

అర్చనం గాననృత్యాద్యం వాదోత్సవ సమన్వితం

కర్తవ్యం విష్ణుభక్తైర్హి పురుషై రనిశం నృప 5

శ్రోతవ్యం చ సదా నిత్యం శ్రోతవ్యోసౌ హరి స్తధా

విష్ణుక్షేత్రే తు యో విద్వాన్ కారయే ద్భక్తిసంయుతః 6

గాననృత్యాదికం చైవ విష్ణ్వాఖ్యానం కథాం తధా

జాతిస్మృతిం చ మేధాం చ తథైవోపర మే స్మృతిం. 7

ప్రాప్నోతి విష్ణుసాయుజ్యం సత్య మేత న్నృపాధిప

ఏత త్తే కథితం రాజన్ యన్మాం త్వం పరిపృచ్ఛసి. 8

కిం వదామి చ తే భూయో వద ధర్మవిదాం వర.

తృతీయోధ్యాయః

అంబరీష ఉవాచ –

మార్కండేయ, మహాప్రాజ్ఞ! కేన యో గేన లబ్ధవాన్

గానవిద్యాం మహాభాగ నారదో భగవాన్ మునిః. 1

సంయమౌ సమాసత్వం కస్మిన్ కాలం ఉపేయివాన్
ఏత దాచక్ష్వ మే సర్వం సర్వజ్ఞో౽సి మహామతే। 2

మార్కండేయ ఉవాచ –

పురో మహాము మద్దై నారదా దైవదర్శనాత్
స్వయం మాయా మహావిద్యా నారదో మహామతి. 3

సంగీతప్రాప్తో భగవాన్ చిన్తం చక్రే యథాక్రమం
నిరాహారేణ సంయుక్త స్త్రింశద్వర్షాణి సంస్థితః, 4

తతాప చ మహాఘోరం తపోరాశి స్తతః పరం
అథాంతరిక్షే శుశ్రావ నారదోసౌ మహామునిః 5

వాణీం దివ్యాం మహాఘోషాం మధ్యే తా మశరీరిణీం
కిమర్థం మునిశార్దూల తప స్తపసి దుశ్చరం. 6

ఉలూకం పశ్య గత్వా త్వం గానే యది రతా మతి:
మానసోత్తరశైలేతు గానబంధు రితి స్మృతః 7

గచ్ఛ శీఘ్రం చ పశ్యైనం గానవేత్తా భవిష్యసి
ఇత్యుక్తో విస్మయావిష్టః నారదో వాగ్మినాం వరః. 8

మానసోత్తరశైలే తు గానబంధుం జగామ హై
గంధర్వాః కిన్నరా యక్షా స్తథా చాప్సరసాం గణాః 9

సమాసీనా స్తుపరితో గానబంధుం తతస్తతః
గానవిద్యాం సమాపన్నాః శిక్షితా స్తేన పక్షిణా. 10

స్నిగ్ధ కంఠస్వరా స్తత్ర సమాసీనా ముదాన్వితాః
తతో నారద మాలోక్య గానబంధు రువాచ హ. 11

ప్రణిపత్య యథాన్యాయం స్వాగతే నార్ఘ్యపూజయా
కిమర్థం భగవ న్నత్ర చాగతో౽సి మహామతే? 12

కిం కార్యం హి మయా బ్రహ్మన్ బ్రూహి కిం కరవాణి తే?

నారద ఉవాచ –

ఉలూకేంద్ర మహాప్రాజ్ఞ! శృణు సర్వం యథాతథం. 13

మమ వృత్తం ప్రవక్ష్యామి పురాభూతం మహాద్భుతం
అతీ తే హి యుగే విద్వన్ నారాయణ సమీపగం. 14

మాం విసిర్జాయ సంప్రాప్తః సమాహూయ చ తుంబురుం
లక్ష్మీసమన్వితో విష్ణు రశృణో ద్గాన ముత్తమం. 15

బ్రహ్మాదయః సురాః సర్వే నిరస్తాః స్థానతః చ్యుతాః
కౌశికాద్యాః సమాసీనా గానయో గేన వైహరిం. 16

ఏవ మారాధ్యసంప్రాప్తా గాణపత్యం యుధాసుఖం
తేనాహ మతిదుఃఖార్త స్తప స్తప్తు మిహాగతః. 17

య ద్దత్తం య ద్ధుతం చైవ యథా వా శ్రుత మేవ చ,
య దధీతం మయా సర్వం కలాం నార్హతి షోడశీం. 18

విష్ణో ర్మాహాత్మ్యయుక్తస్య గానయోగస్య వై తతః
సంచింత్యాహం తపో ఘోరం తదర్థం తప్తవాన్ ద్విజ. 19

దివ్యవర్ష సహస్రం వైతతో హ్యశ్రుణవం పునః
వాణీ మాకాశసంభూతాం త్వా ముద్దిశ్య విహంగమ ! 20

ఉలూకం గచ్ఛ దేవర్షే! గానబంధుం మతి ర్యది
గానే చేద్వర్తతే బ్రహ్మన్ తత్రత్వం వేత్స్యసే చిరాత్. 21

ఇత్యహం ప్రేరిత స్తేన త్వత్సమీప మిహాగతః
కిం కరిష్యామి శిష్యోహం తవ మాం పాలయావ్యయ! 22

గానబంధు రువాచ –

శ్రుణు నారద య ద్వృత్తం పురా మమ మహామతే
అత్యాశ్చర్యసమాయుక్తం సర్వపాపహరం శుభం. 23

భువనేశ ఇతి ఖ్యాతో రాజా భూ ద్ధార్మికః పురా
అశ్వమేధ సహ స్రైశ్చ వాజపేయాయు తేన చ. 24

గవాం కోట్యర్బుదాంశ్చైవ సువర్ణస్య తథైవ చ
వాససాం రథహస్తి నాం కన్యాశ్వానాం తథైవ చ. 25

దత్వా స రాజా విప్రేభ్యో మేదినీం ప్రతిపాలయన్
నివారయన్ స్వకే రాజ్యే గేయయో గేన కేశవం. 26

అన్యం వా గేయయోగేన గాయన్యాది సమే భవేత్
వంధ్యః సర్వాత్మనా తస్మా ద్వేద్రై రాచ్యః పరః పుమాన్ 27